Civil and Religious Forces

William Riley Halstead

LIBRARY OF
Bonebrake Theological Seminary

CIVIL AND RELIGIOUS FORCES.

BY

WILLIAM RILEY HALSTEAD,

AUTHOR OF "FUTURE RELIGIOUS POLICY OF AMERICA."

CINCINNATI:
CRANSTON AND STOWE
NEW YORK:
HUNT AND EATON
1890.

HN
64
.H25
1890

Copyright
BY CRANSTON & STOWE,
1890.

PREFACE.

THIS book, at bottom, is a discussion of the preservative forces underlying civil society in the United States. It is of a kind, therefore, that choice will not be made between it and any book of surface entertainment. It is serious, as it deals with important concerns in the larger practical life of the race. It does not equivocate, because the reader is not treated generously when following the thought of an author who has not put open-hearted sincerity into his work. It is an appeal to history and to reason, and may not be answered with a mild scream. It goes out in search of readers who value the solidity of a foundation, rather than the beautiful fresco and gilded finish of a structure whose base is unsteady.

WILLIAM RILEY HALSTEAD.

BLOOMINGTON, IND., September, 1890.

TABLE OF CONTENTS.

	Page.
I.—The Social Impulse,	7
II.—The Religious Impulse,	17
III.—Civil and Religious Forces correlated,	29
IV.—A Chapter of French History,	50
V.—Germany, Italy, and Mexico,	64
VI.—Civil and Religious Forces in the United States,	68
VII.—Delicacy of the Poise between the Secular and Spiritual,	78
VIII.—The Secular and Ethical Spirit in the Public Schools,	83
IX.—Government by Written Law,	100
X.—The Voluntary Forces constitute the Base of Legislation on Ethical Questions,	108
XI.—Religious Organization and the Spirit of American Law,	131
XII.—Political Parties and the Politicians—the Church and the Preachers,	139
XIII.—What Religion does for the Social Order,	159
XIV.—Mistaken and Hasty Methods for the Overthrow of Social Evils,	180

Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2025

https://archive.org/details/civilreligiousfo0000will

Civil and Religious Forces.

I.

THE SOCIAL IMPULSE.

THERE is that in man which impels him towards civil society. The development and perfection of his faculties depend on human association. Grotius, in his "De Jure Belli et Pacis," says: "Among the properties peculiar to man is the appetite for society; and there is a tendency in him toward the conservation of society. The social impulse, therefore, is the basis of all civil forms." Aristotle says: "Man is naturally a political animal." In his contention that the State originated in the family, it is with the postulate that back of the family is the individual impulse. The social instinct is at first domestic. It produces the family. This, in its turn, becomes the basis of all concerted action among human beings. Corporate responsibility, as a feeling, arises directly out of the reaction of families; and the whole of it is an expression of the social impact in each nature. This is the view of Warburton and Hoadley and Locke. Rousseau, in his "Du Contrat Social," was the first of modern writers to

take these old and fundamental conceptions and give them such philosophic significance as to carry general conviction of their soundness and truth; and yet, unfortunately, he drew out of them the unwarranted conclusions that became largely the instruments of the social disturbances of the French Revolution.

The spirit of association is spontaneous and powerful, as tested by the fact of the almost universal existence of some outward form of human control. Organized society appears to be in the nature and destination of man. It is the necessary response to universal qualities of human nature. The languages of the races have now many terms expressive of what history has been from its social side; but in the beginnings of history no such terms were known, because the abstract idea of human society was not formulated. It existed without a name. It was so natural that it was unconscious of itself. There were no sub-reflections about it. It had rude and simple forms and relationships. The first political aggregate above the family was perhaps the clan, or the tribe formed by the union of clans. From low and simple forms, at any rate, as exigencies prompted, or needs required, social institutions have grown by gradual enlargement into the complex conditions of to-day. When all the facts are put together, it appears that the upward curves of the social scale have but few catastrophes. There has been strife, war, revolution; but the changes

in the outward social forms of the race have been matters of imperceptible transformation. The social machinery, as it is sometimes called, is not an invention or a manufactured article. It is a growth, like the growth of tissue in the body of the child, the unconscious element being the measure of health. The law of growth within, and the conditions of growth without—these produce the child's body. Here, then, is the origin of the forces involved in the civil control of communities. And it is important that the reader have a clear conception of it, because it will help in the settlement of vexed questions further on.

The old Roman idea was that the State centered in the governing power, and came from it. It was not only king, therefore, but autocrat. The individual was nothing except as he contributed toward the advance and perpetuity of that awful thing given of God to take care of the sovereignties. The source of the right of property, the right of taxation, power to create aristocracies and ranks, all inhered in the governing power itself. Self-invoked, self-assertive, self-perpetuating, it was cut away from all responsible relationship to the governed. It therefore took charge of everything, regulated all civil concerns, administered on the family and the thousand other functions of life. It determined all questions of human right, and derived everything from itself. It was a first cause, an ultimate political organism. This idea, however, is older than Rome, as old as

any of the monarchies, among which it was universal. The ancient Egyptian and Persian and Babylonian never dreamed that all the springs and sources of human control lay in himself. He regarded himself rather as a bad boy, needing direction and reproof from the gods; or, which was the same thing to him, from the kings and rulers over him. He supposed, if he thought of it abstractly, that government was born among the clouds somewhere, and that the whole of the social forces playing upon him, making a slave of him, came from above his head, and that they were not matters with which he could or had any right to interfere. His idea was that the authority of the king centered in the king. The right of governernment aggregated in the mass never occurred to him.

Now, civil society is not organized from the State downward. Man is not the servant, and does not exist for an outgrowth of his own nature. He is the unit, the focal; he is greater than all things about him. That man was made for the State, is the basis of all the monarchies and despotisms on earth. No other theory of government had any significant practical application in ethnic times. This was the basis of Sparta's politics. It was both rib and backbone of the Platonic civil creed. It was the justifier of all conquest for dominion. It was the spur and power behind the thrones of the Alexanders, the Cæsars, the Napoleons. It was the grip-hook with which Bismarck held the

German people through the whole of his official career. It is remarkable that this theory of government should have held practical sway for such long periods, when it involved the fact of putting an effect for a cause; the necessity of conceiving the existence of a government, and afterward the people coming into it.

The State is a necessity, and not a first cause. The wagon in which a man rides is not to dominate him, but to serve his purpose. Man exists, then society comes into being. He is the cause of the social compact. It arises out of him and for him. It is his product. It is the scaffolding by which he climbs, and over it he has the right of an autocrat. Principles of association are needed, laws regulating human relationships are needed; but the laws do not constitute the relationships. They come out of the needs and impulses of the governed. No ruler on earth ever originated government. He can ride to power on a false idea; he can exercise tyranny by playing on human credulity and ignorance; but it remains true, even of the worst monarchies of ancient times, that every successfully operative just principle came of the primal nature of man, demanding for the best interests of the individual and the whole, laws and regulations in harmony with the social scheme under which he is placed. Governments in themselves, or the personalities who administer in them, are not primarily causative. We may say that Alexander founded an empire,

and that David consolidated and unified the twelve tribes, and made law significant; but they constituted nothing from first sources. They organized the social impulses. They made what could be made out of dwarfed political forces, ignorance, superstition, race antagonisms; and without despair of these things, they laid far-reaching plans on the coherence of that social instinct in man which through the ages has wrought blessing with law and without it. They may have abused this instinct for the ends of ambition; they may have wrought desolation to kingdoms; but they ordained nothing good that was not founded as a principle in man's social nature. The accretive principle in history is as strong as it is in a colony of bees. It may be the same thing. Whatever it is, we do not know what, it is attractive, and not repressive; it is persuasive, and not coercive; it is an inside something, not an outside something. "The locusts have no king, yet they go forth, all of them, by bands." There is a something in every insect, making it, like its fellows, to choose a common course and destiny. Out of a somewhat like this in man come laws, methods, regulations, instrumentalities of control. Any set of regulative principles drawn from any other source is unnatural, deceptive, dangerous. That which man is in himself, and in his correspondences, must always determine the best outward regulations for his life. Nothing of large value in human government comes from extraneous sources. The whole super-

structure, so far as it is normal, is from the undercurrents, and these are created. Lack of knowledge of this fact among the masses, and resentment to it on the part of rulers, is the blunder, if not the crime, of ancient civilizations. It was the blunder of the organic social forms of the Middle Ages. When government crystallized around landlord and tenant, the landlord gave protection and the tenant gave service; originating the thought that regulative and protective forces were in the landlord, and service to pay for it the tenant's greatest duty.

From this attitude of things, the reader can see that it is only a step to the assumption that constitutions are contracts originating government, rather than expressions of the forms to which social evolution has brought the world. They are formulations of the rights and privileges which the ages of human experience have discovered and derived from the natural fountains of human right and privilege which are in the individual man. Governing forces, therefore, have no right to the exercise of all the power with which they are frequently possessed. The exercise of imposed or secured power to its full limit is not the end of good government. In its higher and more healthful forms, it is held in check by inalienable personal rights and by the popular will. The laws of life, the laws of collective human right, the laws of national growth and decay, are higher and stronger than any imposed

legal forms; and in the last resolve they are supreme over whatever may be opposed to them. The logic of events makes subject to repeal all errors in the codes of men, though the time for repeal be postponed by the lapse of generations. Civil society, in its institutional life, is supposed to be the embodiment of the primary laws of human right, and it is itself responsible to these laws. What these laws are, are largely matters of discovery and experience. We believe they originate in the Infinite Mind.

This belief, however, with the correlated one that the fundamental laws of human control are in complete harmony with man's nature and environment, must be postulated in these pages, as it is not our purpose to enter directly into their discussion further than to get from them the fact that the State itself is responsible to them. The bottom laws of life, for purposes of human government, are as unchangeable as are the laws of the physical code. Man's apprehension and use of these laws reveals an evolution. Through many advances and retrogressions there appears the increment of progress. The race has gradually grown to the application of what it has been pleased to call new political and social principles; and they are no sooner applied, one after another, than they are seen not to be new, but to have been in existence and ready for application from the beginning. We state this to get from it the further statement that statutes and constitutions

are not supreme. They are only more or less complete expressions of what man has learned of higher and as yet largely unwritten laws—the laws of life, of being, of happiness. For the State, therefore, to acknowledge no law higher than itself is monstrous, and to be dreaded. There is no security against it. On such a base it has universally been a tyrant. As a matter of fact, the individual in history has suffered most frequently by oppression from his own country, and this because his country refused to recognize its obligation to the unwritten constitution of the race. Wherever written or established, civil principles have been out of harmony with fundamental qualities in human nature; however universally they may be accepted, they are constantly calamitous. The normal needs of body and heart and mind are fixed factors, and all arrangements of the civil order must have reference to them or fail ultimately.

The race advances socially in the degree that it works on its codes in order to itself. Neither the authority of might, nor standing armies, nor the divine right of kings can form a sufficient basis for the civil structure. The supreme law of national life persistently demands the abolition of all forms which do not have for their end, directly or indirectly, the welfare of the governed. To this States are restricted. Civil institutions are the living organisms of the collective life of the people; and of popular right, they may be worked

out into the forms which will accomplish the best results for the greatest number. If a State, for instance, is not serving its end, that which gave it authority may change it. The spirit which stands for the swiftest advance is not averse to changes of administrative methods or even constitutions. No present form of government ought to be regarded as a finality for the race. The producers of a political creed who propose to swear in all futurity to the insistance that it never be changed, are as reckless of consequences as are the makers of the Church creeds who do the same thing. There are no infallible forms of human government. All social agencies are in their nature tentative; they are improvable; they are constantly coming into more complex relationships and higher conditions. Effete phases, therefore, can be buried without regret, and they can be substituted with those which will meet new circumstances as they appear. The human body has offices, it has functions, it has mechanical pliancies, it has large reflective power over itself; but it has *life*, which is the principal thing. The leading feature of the social body is its *life*, which is the social impulse. It is an original, creative, persistent force. It has had a voice in all history, and its purpose, evidently, is to lead man by slow processes into that perfect scheme of control which was born first in the mind of God.

II.

THE RELIGIOUS IMPULSE.

IN the preceding chapter we have had under discussion man as a social being, having social aptitudes and sympathies; and as a product and result of these, we have society, government, the State. We now approach the fact that he is also a religious being. He has religious aptitudes, religious sympathies, drifts, tendencies. We shall not contend that this religious impulsion has always led him in the right direction or to the truth. If we call it an instinct, it is only unerring to the limit of its power of expression, and we shall not hold it responsible for furnishing proper conditions for its development. The social instinct has not been a guarantee against error in government, or against tyranny and oppression. The religious faculty, as truly a created force as the other, can not justly be held to the responsibility of giving only responses to religious truth. Like all other inborn tendencies, it has been more frequently blinded than otherwise; but, like them, it has always been making imperious demands. It has been appeased through the growth of many unnatural and degrading religious systems.

In response to the religious impulse have been born the outward religious forms of the world.

They are everywhere and in all times. They constitute, without doubt, the widest and most significant range of phenomena of any single class known to man. They have such large proportions in human thought, that no sort of true apprehension of man as he is can be attained without taking them into consideration. To say that they constitute the bulk of the world's ancient and primitive history is to keep within the limits of the truth.

We call to mind here one of the sayings of Plutarch: "There has never been a State of atheists. You may travel over the world; you may find cities without walls, without a king, without a mint, without theaters or gymnasiums; but you will never find a city without a god, without prayer, without oracles, without sacrifice. Sooner may a city stand without foundations than a State without belief in the gods. This is the bond of all society, the pillar of all legislation." Religious belief and faith and custom pervade the world. People are found without houses, without civilization, without clothing, without the marriage-tie or the family, without knowledge of how to build a fire; but none concerning whom any extensive knowledge has been gained, without some object of faith or form of worship. It is in man to fear and adore the higher powers. He can not shake from his faculties the impression of another life. The fiercest struggle of his being adds fuel to the flame of his hope of the

hereafter. Conjectures about the life beyond and the unseen have always occupied a large space in his mind. He may not know, but for evermore he believes he will live forever. In human history this is the most persistent thing with which we are acquainted. It will not down. Ignorance is no bar to it. Culture and civilization, in their highest form, only strengthen it. War and famine and pestilence make no changes in the human heart's ceaseless askings and yearnings for the divine. Age after age it has swept man through the rhythm of all his spiritual powers. It cheers him in his defeats; it rallies him for other conquests after his victories. He has come to know that it sways him. It holds the primacy over his powers.

Alexander Mair says: "There is in man a religious consciousness which must continue to exist." Dr. Cocker says: "Religious ideas and sentiments have prevailed among all nations, and have exerted a powerful influence on the entire course of human history. . . . The voice of all contemporaneous history clearly attests that the religious principle is deeply seated in the nature of man, and that it has occupied the thoughts and stirred the feelings of every rational man in every age. It has interwoven itself with the entire frame-work of human society, and ramified all the relations of human life. By its agency nations have been revolutionized and empires have been overthrown; and it has found a mighty

element in all the changes that have marked the history of man."

The reader will understand that, by this declaration of the universal religious nature of man, it is not meant that he is religiously self-contained, and moves always toward the center of his religious hopes. The thought is of a universal creative quality, that predisposes the normal man to some mode of worship. The question is not now as to the truth or falsehood of the posit of his faith. We are having to do with a general fact of man's constitution.

The position has been taken that all this which we see of religious worship is one of the "ghosts of history"—a sort of "myth of the mind" and a clog to the energies of the race and to progress. Many scholars of no mean prominence now are given to the day-dream that the religious element in history will, sooner or later, be eliminated, and that in its stead science and philosophy and material progress will wholly occupy the thought of the mind, which is finally freed from the old superstitions. The discussion coming out of this, of reason, will resolve itself into the question as to whether the religious feeling in man is of the senses and emotional, or constitutional. Is the religious impulse acquired through superstition and fear, or is it original? Is it a reality? We believe the religious impulse in man will be able to stand every test with the social impulse. We believe that the reasons for its

existence are fully as strong and conclusive, and that it will hold a first place in the world's forces as long as human nature is what it is. Suppose the Bibles of Christendom were obliterated; suppose the Koran, with the Veda and Shaster, were expunged from the earth; suppose every Christian church and college, with every heathen temple and fane, were totally destroyed; suppose the names of Christ, and Mohammed, and Brahm, and Vishnu, and Buddha were driven from the memory of men,—all this would only cut the taproots of man's religious life. The thousand fibers of the human soul would quickly find a response of some kind. Any such process would be like cutting away a great forest wherein the sprouts would come up thicker and stronger than ever. These ceaseless questionings of the why of existence, of the way of life and the future, will always be present, because the mind's interest in them is undying. What child's hand has ever been able to stay the tides of this life in man? What revolutions have ever been able to bury it out of sight for a moment? What opposition and persecution has ever been able to check its intensity? What form of unbelief has ever been able to get above the despair of warring against an unconquerable and quenchless impulse? Would it not be remarkable if no truth should appear at the base of all this religious phenomena? or that, objectively, there was nothing at all in the universe to answer to this perpetual yearning of the

soul? Can it be that when the human spirit is possessed with the religious feeling it is possessed with nothing real and valid as an experience? That with all this religious striving, this search for spiritual truth, this inquiry about life and probation and destiny, this prayer and hope and sacrifice, there should no truth appear until this time, is unworthy the conclusions of any healthful mind.

The existence of doubt with reference to the validity of the religious impact is not strange beyond experience. There has been more or less doubt about everything within the reach of the human understanding. Doubt of all sensuous impressions has at times been very great. The reality of the material universe, and of matter in any form, has been made a serious question and openly disputed. The existence of the physical world has been as formidably opposed as the existence of the spiritual.

The human mind has always been pleased and entranced with the reflection that there is an inside world and an outside world. To this day the writer remembers the place and hour, where and when, he first awoke to reflective consciousness. He calls to mind how pleased he was to be certain that he was a distinct entity in himself, and not a soluble atom of the mass; that he was separated from the birds and leaves and stones; that they had no power to understand, much less to share with him his mysterious being. He was

conscious of his dependence on this outside world, and yet assured that his connection with it was of the slenderest possible kind; that at bottom he was independent and solitary; that he was greater than all the things around him, and, therefore, not to be absorbed by them. Believing these impressions of himself to be normal, he has taken them as intimations of what man is—the inhabitant of an outside universe and the subject of physical law; having great identity with nature, and yet so different that the side of the difference becomes more and more amazing as he comes better to understand it. To overcome a physical force is not the end of effort. Man has always builded highest when he has trusted to his spiritual instincts and motives, and made them the base of his plans.

It has been claimed that what is known as the religious feeling arises from without, to which the senses respond in sympathy. It is occasioned by our contact with the outside world, and will vanish with the senses. It would certainly not be conclusive against any set of phenomena if it were proven to be a matter of the senses; for while the senses are not infallible, and they may deceive us, they alone enable us to touch the world and know it. Some of the finest and most accurate demonstrations of physical science rest on a knowledge we have of the material world through the senses. The validity of the testimony of the senses passes current everywhere in

philosophic and scientific circles. Through repeated tests of the same thing, under like circumstances, and the same answer being given each time, we arrive at reliable scientific conclusions. That which is not reliable in the scientific world finds its refutation in the failure of the tests to respond. The strongest proof of any principle is its invariable persistence in the tests applied to it. Why should not such a test be applied with equal reason to the religious feeling? As an experience, it is as nearly universal as any sense of the material world, and it is as persistent as anything that has been disclosed to the senses. Furthermore, the persistence of phenomena in the material world is taken as evidence that the whole thing is a reality. It is not scientific to believe that positive and uniform tests could be given to a negation. The persistence of religious phenomena signifies the reality of the religious potential in the human spirit.

But it is claimed that if the religious feeling has the quality of an original force or instinct common to man, that it would have at least two particular and invariable features. It would be universal as to individuals and unerring. It is claimed that there are not only tribes without worship, but intelligent individuals with no apparent religious sense or feeling. It is not good logic to argue the absence of a thing because it is not seen. It would have been lame in an ancient philosopher to have said that there could not be

such a thing as electricity, or the application of steam, or the telephone, because we had never seen such things. We can not say the religious potential is wanting in any being because it has not been seen. A few inches under the ground may be a diamond rich enough to deck the brow of a queen. Thousands of weary feet may have marched over it, suffering with hunger and cold, when its possession would have made them princes. The jewel is there, and it only needs uncovering and the wheel of the lapidary and the sunshine, not to give it, but to *bring out* its hidden glory. So with the human spirit. It is rich in possibilities. It was created for high destinies. Like the concentrated carbon, it has in it an inherency of value. Man has always been under the impression that his being is connected with a high purpose, and that somehow this purpose is in close fellowship with the religious strivings of his own spirit. He is convinced of this, if with no other argument than the lights and shadows of an infinite thought which he has seen play over his whole history. At one time it hushes his soul as a worshiper, and he bows in awe and gazes on the stars and believes they are gods; at another time he trembles in the presence of the storm-cloud, and believes it is the hand of an unappeased deity. At one time he is kneeling before some symbol of a god, the bitter fruit of his own mechanism, but believing that, beyond the form he sees, his soul reaches back to the spirit of the world. At an-

other time he is a bacchanal in the lowest revelries of paganism. At one time he becomes familiar with the natural agencies of the world, and he rises above all fear, and enthrones his work in such philosophic grandeur that a Plato reaches up and grasps the hand of the true God. At other times he becomes weary of his forms of faith, and goes to sleep apparently for a long repose, and is awakened straightway by revolution. So the life of worship, which is the life of history, if it disappears in one form, will reappear in another; it will be perpetuated and conserved, and made stronger through its changes. All this signifies a spontaneous and primal element in human nature. It is in evidence that the subjective base of man's religious life is an *a priori* quality in himself, the quality which makes him capable of the grasp and communion divine. It is this quality which occasions the persistent and inward striving of the soul after God, and with it that awful sense, so pitiful at times, that unless the divine is found the soul is lost.

The doctrine of the intuitive source of the religious feeling, or a subjective faith, from which all religious phenomena are an outgrowth, has been defended by Schleiermacher and Jacobi and others. Dr. Cocker contends for a modification of this thought on the ground that outside conditions and contacts are necessary in order to bring these intuitions to the human consciousness. Ex-President McCosh believes that these ideas of

God and the future life do not arise from a single primitive judgment, but from a number of correlated ideas, each of which is capable of greater or less analysis.

The subjective foundation for man's faith is also strengthened in a remarkable way by the Word, which does not undertake to prove the existence of the divine, or the fact of a future life, or other first principles. Some things were established before the Book was written, and in order that it might be written. Some truths arise spontaneously out of the nature of things. One of these is that the soul is so constituted that it is never satisfied, that it will die unless it finds rest and center in God. Like a harp which rude hands have struck, some of its strings are broken; but when life's fingers sweep over its chords, its fineness is detected, and the despair of its being restored is banished. Man was made for better things than all this sorrow. He was made to gravitate toward God. He was organized for God. His birthright is in him.

We shall not here discuss theories of religion or institute a comparison of systems. Such is not the object of this book, and we shall accept the Christian system when we come later to its application. The purpose of this chapter on the religious impulse is to set forth the fact of man's religious nature in such a light as to show the folly of making any estimates of life or society without counting it in. Man's religious nature is

on as sure a footing as his social nature. We shall not know how the world has lived if we ignore this sentiment; and we shall hardly be able to give directions for the present without putting it in the count.

Mr. Spencer, in a certain place, gives us directions how to live in the widest sense. He lists the activities of human life, and draws a beautiful picture; but in the whole category he does not give the slightest hint that man has a religious nature. Among all the activities the religious activities are counted zero. He finds no place for the spirit of reverence or prayer. He leaves out a supreme fact.

III.

THE CIVIL AND RELIGIOUS FORCES ARE CORRELATIVES.

WE have approached the third mile-stone of this discussion. We have proposed to show the existence and force of two natures in man—the social and the religious. We have been presenting them so far apparently as separate facts in his nature; but in reality they are not so.

The faculties of the mind may be examined and studied separately; but there is no such thing as the separation of the mental faculties. The mind is a unit. The dissecting knife can not be drawn through it. Through the mental phenomena we get apprehension of distinct mental powers, and yet these powers are not independencies. Each mental faculty is bolstered by all the others, and it takes them all to make the mind what it is. So man is a unit. His social and religious natures, normally operative, furnish each other with counterpoise and balance. And wherein they have been out of adjustment and harmony, they have been the greatest robbers of his happiness.

We are now to regard these two qualities of man's nature as the potentials of two great systems of forces, which have been operative from

the beginning, and around which history focalizes. As to master them is to master history, it will be the object now to take the reader on a brief historic journey to examine their relationships before we proceed to applications of the civil and religious forces to the present age, and to our own times and country.

Among the people of the first ages the religious instinct was the greater force. The social impulse appeared at first to be a secondary influence. At least, man's religious life had earlier and fuller expression than his social life. This fact may be the measure of the importance of the two sides. One involves more; that is, it has in it greater possibility. One is with reference to this life, the other is for the endless life. The fact that the human spirit has intimations of its immortality is of greater significance than equally strong intimations that it has a social destination limited to this life. In the original make-up, the springs of the immortal correspondences may have been made stronger than the others.

The Jewish people, for instance, were organized and controlled for generations through their religious instincts. That which would now be recognized as purely civil and secular had a small place in the Hebrew economy. The God-idea was supreme. The theocratic spirit remained so strong among this people that the social instincts on their own acçount never gained any sort of independent footing until Christ's time. It appears

somewhat remarkable to the modern student that there was no such thing as organic solidarity of the civil and religious in early times. There was the absorption of things, one into the other, with the religious forces preponderating, of course; but the dual operation of the two systems did not occur to the ancient mind. The Jew believed that the civil government had a religions function, and he was a representative in that belief of the world about him.

From the stand-point of the Christians, the final purpose of the Jewish code was to impress on the world the deistic conception; and it ceased to be operative as soon as its end was accomplished. The Jewish system was never presented as the ideal form of government. As a special providence for a special end it is self-explanatory. It took its place in the evolution of the world's social and religious forces; and it was closed, it was decomposed in the presence of higher applications of law, both human and divine.

The kingdoms of Babylon and Medo-Persia bring us a vision of splendid confusion in social and religious ideas. They were absolute monarchies, in which the sum total of all tendencies was but little more than a photograph of the ruler's mind. The Eastern monarch is rarely otherwise than haughty, superstitious, and unscrupulously ambitious. He hesitates at no means. The religious element among his subjects being usually very strong, he made it dangerous. When

an excuse was wanted for an atrocity, the gods would make the declaration, and any resistance of the gods, of course, was sacrilege. So the fearful tyrannies of these empires were perpetrated in the name of the gods. The religious element being a perpetual fact, was the ready agency of unmeasured cruelties, and its vicious use furnishes an explanation of the downfall of these empires. Every law of associated life was violated; every human right was disregarded, while the tyrant was posing, as the direct instrument of the gods, or as possessing divine power himself. The rulership of a single mind and will, under the leverage of such successful agencies, is in itself almost a sufficient explanation for the world's movement through ages of its history, without being able to get itself settled on the sanctions of that which is natural in human association. Gibbon has given to the world a clear statement of the state of things to which we have alluded. He says that the human mind, under the sway of barbarism, is known to be submissive to its superstitions, even after the outward authority of the State which is in existence over him has not been able to control him. It is because of this, no doubt, that the religious forces in these ancient kingdoms have so constantly been called to take the place of defective civil policies. This has occasioned the inseparable connection of ancient laws with ethnic religions. All the older codes have the impress of the idea that they are a series of regulations handed down

from ancestors, who received them direct from the gods. This element in them had the force to compel more complete obedience as long as the people believed in the gods from whom they were supposed to be derived; and this fact also set the seal of infallibility on them; instance, the famous "laws of the Medes and Persians." This fact also made them incapable of modification or change. Changes in the codes of ancient civilizations were by revolution. The authority of rulers became a part of the religion of the people, and for this purpose kings were frequently deified. The history of these peoples strikingly illustrates the defects in their conceptions of governing law. The calamities which befell them tell the tale. What a sad comment, that these nations had power to kill and slay and conquer, but had no power to institute for themselves an extended rule! Lack of distinction as to the spheres of the civil and religious forces, is in great measure an explanation of the world's sad record of national decay and death.

Following these reflections, it must appear that out of such an atmosphere and soil the growth of what might now be called the secular spirit was necessarily slow; and it may not be a difficult matter to interpret some of the changes through which it has passed. It is of general acceptance now that the mythologies originated in nature-worship. The study of language in the last twenty years has cleared many a puzzle to

the student of history. Words expressive of objects of worship, traced to their root-forms, explain the thought that lies at the root of worship, and show all ethnic systems to be akin. The gods of the different nations, with different names, still have great identity. They appear to have come from a common source. They have a sort of paternity in the ultimate and most simple forms of nature-worship. Take the savage, having within him the yearning and potential for the invisible, which has already been described. He has only knowledge enough to build his hut, to shape his battle-ax, and perhaps to live in the family relation. In the face of nature, he is like a child. Everything is realistic. He looks at the world as through a telescope with an unsettled base, and he gets a blurred image. Without the advantages of experience to subsidize his impressions, and get him started with the realities, he personates everything. Volition stirs the leaves, and an angry Being shakes the mountain with his thunder. Whatever is strange, or powerful, or vast, impresses him with dread. His faith in this state, if it can be called such, is a kind of nebulous feeling. Religious impressions are there, but they come to him like objects to the mind of a child when it first opens its eyes on the world. There is the instinct and yearning for the spiritual—a kind of reaching out into the dark. This is the age of realism. All the great forces of nature are deified; and, without knowing why, this

savage worships and adores. If the great Supreme has entered his thought, it is through the voices of nature's forces. He lives in a shadowy land. In the morning twilight of his being he gets glimpses of the Infinite, and his untutored brain is soon found giving him form. His hand makes a model, and the model becomes his god. This is the age of spontaneous belief.

It has often been that centuries have gone by before savage races have come from under the struggle for existence, and have been made acquainted with nature to know that it was a great scheme of law, and devoid of the definite intelligence which has been attributed to it. With the study of nature mythology fades. The human mind, not without some pain, passes from its states of spontaneous belief, and begins the work of inward and outward scrutiny. Man may open his eyes to see, and then shut them to think. He has then reached the stage of introspection.

Now, without pursuing this thought further, or following its delicate tracing through the great laws of life, it will be sufficient for our purpose to say here that the first hopeful age of introspective thought was about the time of the incarnation. It centered, perhaps, at Athens. Athens had been for a few centuries the home of philosophy. Art had become adorable. An aristocracy of thinkers had been born. The age of Homer had been exchanged for the age of Aristotle and Socrates and Plato.

Aristotle asks: "What is the end of human action?" Socrates says: "Know thyself." Plato declares that the elements of all knowledge are revealed from within; that there is a world of real being beyond this world of sense. He declares that a man can think with his senses closed. So, from absolute ideas he ascends to the conception of an absolute Being—an infinite and absolutely good Being. This is Platonism, and the maturity of unaided human thought in that direction.

The flashes from this high arena went out to touch all ancient thought. The common religious beliefs lost their hold on intelligent minds. The infallible features of the civil codes, enforced by authority of the gods, lost their efficiency. Skeptical Romans climbed the heights of Olympus, and discovered that the gods did not reside there, and the whole product of religious belief which had been born of the spontaneous age began to lose its power over the informed. The civil spirit, born of the social nature for the ends of society, now had a chance of free development. The chance was not lost. The civil power became dominant, and religion was subordinated. The Roman empire came to her power under the sway of the civil forces. Her people were imbued with the love of law and order, and she carried her principles of civil obedience into her conquered territories; and she made it a point to define the rights and privileges of a Roman citi-

zen in all her vast dominions. While the Roman idea was that government originated in rulers, and while these rulers frequently asserted divine right, and were frequently deified and as frequently made use of the religious element as a power of control over the lower classes, winking at the ignorance that moved them, the Roman spirit was distinctly secular. It was Rome. It was Rome above the gods. The religion of conquered peoples was regarded as an underplay.

The ascendency and control of the secular spirit as distinguished from the religious was the intellectual atmosphere into which the great Teacher was born; and more completely than any philosopher on earth, he contributed toward the solution of the vexing problem in the profoundest and most far-reaching politico-religious utterance ever made: "RENDER THEREFORE UNTO CÆSAR THE THINGS WHICH ARE CÆSAR'S, AND UNTO GOD THE THINGS THAT ARE GOD'S." The aged Leopold Ranke once said: "This is the most important and influential word of Christ."

CHRIST'S TEACHING AND THE APOSTOLIC AGE.

The first disciples were curious about many things. They supposed, in the outcome, He would set up a temporal kingdom, and deliver the Jews from the Roman yoke; and they have the least conception of the "kingdom within"

of which he speaks. As they had committed themselves to his cause, they supposed their relation to the secular government had been changed, and they desired to know the status of things between the Master's preaching and Cæsar's government. A position of neutrality or independence appeared impossible to them. That a Jew in the line of the house of David should assume a neutral position as to the present ruling powers, was to the Jewish mind intolerable; and to the Roman authorities it was by no means satisfactory. Christ's answer, therefore, to the question, "Is it lawful to give tribute unto Cæsar?" was of matchless force and significance; and, in connection with it, we must justify some remarkable things in his life. First, he refused to exercise the functions of the civil life; second, he refused to appeal to force to advance his cause, or even for his own protection; third, he says, "My kingdom is not of this world." Concerning this feature of Christ's life, Dr. Strong says: "Christ refused to be made king, and his refusal of the nation's offer of the scepter ought to teach those who are trying to save the world that moral means are necessary to moral ends. Christ saw that the world could not be saved by legislation; that only by his being lifted up could all men be drawn unto him. The gospel is the radical cure of the world's great evils; and its promulgation, like its spirit, requires sacrifice."

The emergency clause of the gospel was a

surprise to the disciples. They did not really know what he meant when he said, "The kingdom of God is within you." They were to preach the truth. They were to go independently of the civil authority, expecting no help, and for the time no friendship. They were not to go in antagonism; but they were to ask for nothing and fear nothing, after they had given personal obedience to the laws of the lands in which they traveled. By this plan of procedure the early Church and the civil powers were declared separate, having different and distinct jurisdictions. They were to be neither in organic alliance nor antagonism. The civil forces were at first largely antagonistic, but the gospel conquered a peace. It compelled the friendship of the civil power by the nature of its work on civil society. The gospel made quiet and good citizens everywhere. It revealed its value by giving to the State finished products of citizenship. The living power of this independent gospel awed the State into the courtesy of a recognition, and showed itself the preservative of the social order. The disciples had gone out without other authority than the lowly Nazarene, and they made headway in the world with both opinion and authority against them. Within a comparatively brief period of time, the aggressive force of the message they bore had brought ethical products of remarkable value to the civil power. This brought to the early Church its first general triumph, and this

triumph was the prophecy of the victories of the first great age of evangelical Christianity.

THE LATIN CHURCH.

In course of time the Church saw darker days. After this growing Christian life had come to respectability, and thence to ascendency; after tetrarchs and governors and soldiers and senators and emperors became worshipers; after sagacious and unscrupulous men had placed themselves in high ecclesiastical authority; after the divine favor of a thousand successes under the Christ plan of the beginning,—there came the weariness which, with great fatality, has since followed some of the greatest successes of Christian truth. It was the weariness which always searches for an easier way than that of prayer and holy living and sacrifice. It was the weariness which nurtures the dream that the world can be saved in the swift and plausible methods brought about by the Church assuming the functions of the kingdoms of this world, even if the central side of the gospel be for the time put in the background.

The old fire began to burn low, the old enthusiasm began to wax faint. The missionary idea of the first two or three centuries, which had made the gospel such a power in the Roman dominions, was slowly being transmuted into a struggle to build up an outward and ecclesiastical power. Also the benefices of the Church were becoming too fat for martyrs. The spiritual forces

of the gospel, which in the earlier times had been as seed sown on good ground, were now getting into a mummy's hands. The great arguments for sin and redemption, whose force was to transform lives, grew less efficient and convincing. The personal Christian life became less and less representative. And, on the other hand, the arguments for the assumption of civil control became more clearly defined, and they were finally taken for the perfection of reason.

It began to be claimed for the keys of St. Peter, that they might unlock for the secular kingdoms the blessings they had sought for ages. Christianity had been a redeeming and regenerating force in the empire. It had declared itself equal to exigencies for which the ethnic religions were unequal. If the gospel was divine, if the Lord was in it, would it not be better for the civil power to yield to the voice of the Lord, or, which is the same thing, those who speak for him? How could rulers refuse to obey such a voice? Finally, the wonder was that the world had not long ago arrived at this millennium of conditions, that of committing the governments of this world into the hands of the saints. There was a slow yielding, not without some revolt from the civil side, to these specious arguments.

Roman emperors saw in Christianity the elements for the highest control of civil society. There was a period of Platonic courting; then, on the part of the civil power, a patronizing air, a

sort of lording it over the Church, those in authority in the Church consenting for a consideration. Constantine, holding world-wide civil dominion, shrewdly awakened in the minds of ambitious ministers the hope of world-wide Church dominion, by his offer of supervision and by the power of jurisdiction he would give to the religious forces. Constantine courted the Christians, just as Bismarck courted the Catholics. Reasons of State justified all scruples. And there was the Christian ambition for the splendid results which might follow the formal recognition and indorsement of the greatest Government on earth. The Church recognized; the emperor humbling himself at her meanest altars—finding his name therefor in all the Churches—the demagogues soon saw in the Church a chance of favor and power. It came to pass that high places in the Church were being filled by ambitious men, who were pleased to see that they could control civil incumbents by the influences of the Church; and they were swift to make use of the advantage. An inch was given, an ell was taken. Finally bishops were transmuted into the vicegerents of God, and under their dictation were the leading civil powers of the empire. Local civil regulations, State laws, kingdoms, the empire, were finally the servant of the Church.

When this unnatural alliance and dominancy had come about, and during the time of its coming, the Church turned from its converts whom it

had evangelized, and sought the support of the civil power. It slowly lost its evangelical zeal. It paid less and less attention to the poor. The Christian life was less and less a pattern of Christ. The Church found itself more and more depending on outward forms. More and more it became weary of the old way of propagating the gospel. More and more were its energies turned toward legislating the millennium into being. And the result was a shaken faith, a lax morality, and a fearful reign of corrupt and neglected legislation, and a final burial of the finest forces of human faith and patriotism in the charnel-house of the Dark Ages.

The Roman era proclaimed and achieved the complete subordination of the civil to the ecclesiastical power; and no more fearful and corrupting tyranny over human life has ever been known than the tyranny of the papacy in later Roman history. The position was taken and held by the Roman Catholic Church that the civil power must be under the control and direction of the Church. The dominance of the ecclesiastical force in the name of its divine right was a splendid deception. It was deceptive as a theory, and deceptive in its applications through the whole of its beginnings. Among the Latin people its worst ends did not appear in the beginning, nor for generations; but its closing work ushered in the disintegrating forces that led to the downfall of the empire and opened the way to the flooding hordes of barbarous Northmen.

This grasp, with which the religious life held the civil power so long, is to be regarded in its consequences as the most disastrous in all history. If we were to make a bill of charges, we would put down against it: First, the death of Latin Christianity. Second, the decline of the Roman Empire. Third, the long wintry night of nearly a thousand years, in which Europe made no advance in any of the arts of civilization. Fourth, the fatal results which have followed the Italian and Portuguese and Spanish people as they have spread over the world. In their settlement of Mexico and the South American States and the west coast of Africa, they have carried with them the old Romish idea of ecclesiastical supremacy. With it Mexico has been cursed through its history, and is only just now beginning to emerge into the light, since a few years ago she shook off the incubus of the priesthood, and confiscated the property of the Church. The South American Republics have all felt, and some are still under the clutch of this monster oppressor. Slowly they are rising to shake it off, but only after centuries of hindrance and repression; and the territory will then be left doubly difficult to cultivate with the seed of a pure gospel. So, too, nearly the whole of the west coast of Africa has been left twice dead with the blast of the Romish idea. Fifth, the old principle still lives in a great organization, which, with it, now sways a most fearful despotism of moral forces; and, if the opportunities for

supremacy and civil dominion ever come again, the world will have no right to complain if it is exercised in all of its ancient vigor. Rome can administer on the civil policies of the whole world to-day and be entirely consistent. Rome has a right to her theology, to her whole system of Scripture interpretation, to her form of Church government, to her evangelical aggressive agencies in the open field of the world; but when she claims the right of civil dominion, when she figures without scruple in politics, she is the enemy of my country.

The older historians speak of a time they call the Middle Ages. It comprises the period between the fall of the Latin Empire and the outbreak of the Reformation. We accept this as substantially correct for the sake of brevity; for our object is not history, but the tracing of a couple of cardinal forces.

In the later Roman time, after the Vandal had invaded the Transalpine countries, it became known that he had as little respect for religious rights and ceremonies as he had for the complaints of a conquered civil foe. The outlook for a generation or two after this irreverent barbarism had begun to descend into Southern territories, was that the most sacred agencies of the Church would be pillaged and destroyed. On the part of the Church the time came for a change of tactics. To the civil power of the old order it could dictate terms; but this uncouth stranger, not being able to appreciate the situation, was perpetually violating

the proprieties. The fact of his being down there signified that he was too strong to be coerced, and he must be managed in some other way. With almost indecent haste on the part of ecclesiastics, there was a change of base. They assumed a cringing attitude of friendship to the newcomer; and with it there was a mixture of the missionary spirit, an attempt at conversion for self-protection. The Church rulers soon proclaimed what is known in history as the "truce of God." It was a sudden withdrawal from interest in human affairs. There was diligence in the teaching that there were some things too innocent and too awfully sacred to come under the ban of even an enemy. The sanctuaries of the Church were proclaimed the common and peaceful meeting-ground of those who had been estranged by the quarrels and factions of war. The Church was declared to be the neutral ground for the warriors. There was no assumption of civil or outward supremacy for the time; there was no proclamation of even the doctrine of civil and religious co-ordination. The complete separation of the civil and religious powers was loudly proclaimed.

This change of base had its rewards. It kept the good-natured Vandal from much spoliation of Church property. As a plan of protection it was finely invented, and it was finely worked. But it was only a temporary shifting. It was made operative only as exigencies showed it to be needful. The old ambition for temporal

control crept back with every hope of its exercise. This "truce of God," however, after having been made effective with the barbarian, was not easily banished. It took quite a hold on the Church, and remained among the masses for generations. It went down with it into the troublous and uncertain feudal time. The abode of the priest and nun was made a sort of city of refuge for the persecuted of all classes, and frequently for criminals; but in the central policies of the Roman Church it never occupied more than the position of a makeshift. The popes kept contending with the civil powers even for the administration of civil justice. So the organized life of a spirit once dominant contested the ground, inch by inch, with the civil power, and never gave over the hope that the sword might carry the gospel to the world. This undecided battle went down into the Dark Ages, and shaped its whole history.

THE SHIFT OF ATTITUDE IN THE REFORMATION.

Every student of history knows that the dogma of the divine right of the pope was pushed successfully through the period which followed the decay of Roman glory; and with the break of light on this side, no scholar need be told how nearly all Europe came of being consolidated into one great and overmastering ecclesiastical oligarchy.

The hand of God appeared to be reaching

down to help the nations when Martin Luther was born. The Word of God, in his heart and brain, was as the blowing of a heavenly atmosphere over fires that had been slumbering for a thousand years. Christianity now gave hope of being robed in a vesture of gold. Stirring questions of individnal right began to magnify all the tendencies of reformative thought. Under the magnetic and powerful touch of this new giant; the downfall of the Latin order of things, which had so dwarfed society, seemed imminent. But after the new movements had gone on for years—after Luther had accomplished his work and gone to his grave—so intense was the struggle against the old supremacy over the rights of private faith, that it appeared necessary for the princes who had espoused the new doctrines to have an understanding with each other, and to take the struggling and persecuted Churches under the protection of the civil power for security. The organic relation of the civil and religious forces was therein retained; but a new relationship existed. It was civil supremacy now. The State became the patroness of religion. To take all religious interests under its control, and foster and provide for their maintenance, was supposed to be the ideal of State loyalty to God. While this meant sincerely protection to religious interests, it also meant subordination to the degree that the State will hold the day in case of emergency. In the light of his-

tory, it has in it the adroit features of diplomatic caution.

This reformation-order of things is substantially the working order in nearly all Europe today, and into this working in several of the States we now desire briefly to enter.

IV.

A CHAPTER OF FRENCH HISTORY.

THE sincere student of history recognizes as a law of investigation the fact that phenomena overlie principles, and that things do not appear without causes. So the social conditions with which any people have been surrounded can only be understood when the forces that have produced them have been understood.

The Reformation never completed itself among the French people. Through a long and fearful struggle Romanism came out in the ascendant. It was not at all times able to use in its own name the sword of temporal authority; but it was shrewd to make use of conditions which the Reformation had brought about, and it was able indirectly to command the services of the State to intrench a strong and ultimately corrupt and tyrannous ecclesiasticism. The force and purpose of the old domination was in the Church, and the limitations that would have appeared to have come to it in the change of center from itself to the civic power, was not, in the long run, any great hindrance to securing about whatever it desired. French ultramontanism has never shown any scruples over making the largest use of the ignorance of the masses to reach its pur-

poses. It has all along wielded without stint a moral despotism, and, with now and then a severe spasm of complete resistance, it has held great influence over the French civil authorities.

In order that we may see the more clearly the calamities of the organic alliance between Rome and the French civil power, we take our bearings from the principal character of French history, Napoleon Bonaparte. Napoleon was born in 1769 and died in 1821. It will appear in evidence, therefore, that between these years occurred the most fearful system of wars with which Europe was ever visited. The birth of Napoleon may also be taken as a relative date to mark the beginning of the decay of all that was pure in doctrine and life in the Romish Church. At this time it possessed extensive temporal dominion, and this dominion had been operative long enough to produce the usual consequences. The Church had come to a condition where it was constantly selecting the short and easy way rather than the true way of advancing the gospel kingdom. It had harnessed its destinies to the uncertain issues of temporal diplomacy. It had become imperious and dictatorial and corrupt. With the free atmosphere then blowing across the continent, there came a spirit of revolt against the oppression produced by the attitude of the Church toward liberty and private investigation. There was the breaking away of many independent minds, and a rebound from the religious life

itself. The sacrifice which had to be made, and the persecution that must be endured, for the sake of independent thinking, produced such a tension of thought and feeling that the intellectual revolt brought to the people the fatuity of a resentment not only against religious belief, but also against the rules of moral uprightness. The movement against the hierarchy was made the occasion of a wide-spread movement, full of folly, toward the burial of the religious instincts. The life and character of Napoleon Bonaparte was the exponent of this age more fully than any other character in European history. Henry Ward Beecher contended that no man was ever ahead of his age. Leaders of human thought have only caught the impulse of their age in advance of others. They are the interpreters of the subtle forces of their times. Napoleon was a part of his age. He was a reflection. He was born and nurtured in the morbid conditions of a decaying faith, and when religion, for lack of representatives, was having no power over the life. Napoleon's greatness was in interpreting his time—in getting into the current, and in making it resistless by so doing. He was about twenty years of age when unbelief and distrust of the Church was at its highest in France, and his spirit is its most significant product. He was without conscience. Duty to him was a hateful word. He could say, "In Alexandria I am a good Mohammedan; in Rome, a good Catholic."

He used the truth only where it suited his purpose. Chastity was a convenience. He divorced Josephine because he willed it. Near his dying hour he received the sacrament, and then made a bequest to the man who attempted to assassinate Wellington. His armies amounted to nearly four millions of men, and very few of them ever returned from the campaigns. The destruction of enemies perhaps exceeded this loss of life, and the debts of the Napoleonic wars yet hang like an incubus over Europe.

Such a spirit to-day would be put out of sight in the opening of its career. His life and character would be impossible for the present. He was significantly the exponent of his time. The consequences of the unnatural alliance of Church and State produced the monster century and the monster man.

Romanism—dictatorial, corrupt, and undertaking to exercise the civil functions with an imperative hand—brought disrespect and indifference in the public mind toward religious matters, and finally deliberate and open revolt. In 1790 the National Assembly declared that all ecclesiastical officers should take an oath for the civil constitution of the clergy. This was the first step. It was a halter. There was a break with the Church in popular thought, and, as usual, the popular will was more practical than philosophical, and there was a break with the system which it espoused. It was only three years after this that Christianity

was declared to be abolished. God was defied in the name of the Government. The Sabbath was abolished. So was baptism. State documents were blackened with blasphemous utterances, priests were banished, Church property was rifled and destroyed, and the new era was declared. Liberty, Equality, Fraternity, were the watchwords of a fearful movement, which neither comprehended nor secured anything worth naming of either. With religious restraints removed, with the moral code abolished, the worst elements of society soon came to the surface. Riot and lawlessness and rapine ruled the day. Pandemonium was set up. The furies were let loose. The generation became utterly godless. The Ten Commandments were abolished, and over the entrance to many cemeteries was written the inscription, "Death is an eternal sleep." In fact, no civilized nation has ever known the depth of degradation to which the French nation plunged; and following this reign of the abolition of all religious belief was the most disastrous and unhappy period the French people ever saw. Hagenbach, the historian, says of the revolt against the religious life and its beliefs: "The whole social life of France is wildly abandoned to the rough forces of carnal idolatry and communism. . . . The evangelization of France belongs to a picture of the millennium."

Napoleon saw this moral havoc, and he recognized its cause, unexpected as it may have been to

him, and with great adroitness he made true estimates on the outward forms of religion as a tranquilizer. In 1803 Napoleon re-established the Church, and the peace and order that followed was remarkable, in view of the fact that only the hull of that which constitutes a real Church was ever restored. The re-establishment of the Church, however, being the old embodiment, now somewhat chastened, from which there had been general revolt, brought no civil millennium. Napoleon's act was not for the good in itself, but with an eye on the pope; for three years after the pope made Napoleon emperor. The Church then appeared to be on its feet again, and apparently in a fair way for dominion. The pope, taking his supremacy for granted, proceeded to excommunicate all who had destroyed or appropriated Church property. Then Napoleon proceeded to imprison the pope, and, as soon as he retracted, Napoleon established the Concordat. He was wise enough to see that human society is not secure without the brace and prop of its religious life.

The adversities of the Revolution brought a sort of despair to the hearts of the French people. The impious attempt to abolish God, and the causes and consequences of the wars which followed, were such as to convince many minds of the necessity, as well as the value, of the influence of a superior power in human affairs. A popular revolt against divine authority is always a prophecy of a cry of despair soon to follow. Social forces

somehow have a dependence on the general sense of the divine in man's nature; and the adversities of French history constitute perhaps the best illustration the world has given of the fact.

The Revolution has gone by. The spirit of moderation has followed its pathetic history; but the whole land is yet suffering from the irreparable harm. The French people have had fits of returning to the religious forces; but they have never been able to shake off the spirit of revolt against moral principles which the Revolution so magnified. The last one hundred years of French history is of a nation with a low moral life. There have been successful revolts against every form of faith, or every system of teaching which proposed to bind the conscience to the obligations of right living. In public affairs questions of principle are not discussed, but the *coup d'etat.* Questions of obligation or duty urged on the French Assembly are received with a supreme but cultured scorning. The sanctities of the home, especially in the polished capital, are now buried; but the funeral was conducted with the highest art and the greatest discretion. The minds of the French youth are yet filled with the writings of Guizot, Millemaine, and the Encyclopedists and Voltaire.

At the close of the Franco-Prussian War, after the German soldier had marched into the heart of the French capital (a defeat whose causes are to be found in the conditions of French history, and

in the French character), and the people had been stung with defeat and humiliated, there appeared shortly the fearful Commune. The worst elements of the people, the scum of the city, came to the surface to control, and for ten days run riot. It was a revolt against authority, human and divine. It took upon itself an atheistic and blasphemous character unparalleled in the annals of men. The churches were denounced as places where men were morally assassinated. One of the venerable fathers of the Church of St. Pierre was brought before Raoul Rigault, the principal character of the insurrection. Raoul Rigault asks:

"What is your profession?"

"I am a servant of God."

"Where does he live?"

"Everywhere."

"Issue a warrant of arrest for this one called God, who, in violation of law, has no permanent residence, and is living in vagabondage."

Recently the municipal Council of Paris has decided to introduce a new grammar in the public schools written by Da Costa, a man who was once condemned to death for communistic crimes. This text-book does not ignore God, but the terms God and soul are used in derision. He says: "If it has been the pleasure of the ministers to take out a patent on the belief in God, it has pleased the City Council to prevent such teaching entering the public schools."

A friend of Rigault thanks citizen Da Costa

for furnishing the means by which children shall know that intelligence is a function of the brain; that man is an animal of the order mammalia; that he is not the noblest animal, but the most intelligent.

It is reported that the scourge of immoral literature is worse in France than any other land. Petitions have lately gone to the Assemby, accompanied with arguments to show the close connection between these vicious pages and the foulest crimes, asking for restrictive legislation, all to no purpose.

This is France of to-day. It is the course of a nation without a healthful religious life. The greatest students of French history now set the source of these down-grade movements in the loss of the real religious life among the people. We present the instances to bring out the fact.

The spirit of the Revolution was to lay the foundations of human liberty in reason, but it was a reason that postulated the non-existence of religious facts and principles. It was a liberty to be reared in spite of the Church, which was well in itself, because the Church there opposed every advance in that direction; but the Revolution did not distinguish between the Church and the religious life of the race—a thing which can never be eliminated or ignored, and must be counted in the erection of every structure of liberty, and must have its place in all the equations of human progress. The rock on which the

French republic threatens to strand to-day, as stated by Lacour, is "the religious question in the province of the school." The lovers of political liberty see that its greatest enemy is that ecclesiasticism that refuses to keep its hand off civil concerns, and proposes to assert its claims on the childhood of the nation until there is no longer any hope; and as this great Church is the posit of the religious life of the people, so far as they have any, what is to be done?

Emile de Laveleye, the Belgian politico-economist, seeing the necessity of a religious life in French society, declares in favor of any Church in which liberty is advocated and upheld. He makes a strong appeal to French Protestants to make use of a great opportunity. That outward state of thought whose tendencies are to found an edifice of liberty on secular reason alone, and in opposition to the religious life, is largely responsible for the unsettled conditions which have bred the present social enslavement, and the only emancipation is by religious reformation voluntarily invoked.

The famous Quinet once declared that political emancipation could only be effectual with the condition that it is based on religious reform. M. Thiers said to a deputation of Protestants: "Were there more of your way of thinking, I would have more hope of the stability and permanence of the republic." Disciple of Voltaire that he was, he was statesman enough to know the social value

of a clear and definite religious belief and a sound ethical teaching.

A settled religious faith which the reason and conscience can respect, is the strongest preservative of a free government. It gives a contentment of spirit, a moderation and constancy of character, that can not be produced by other social agencies. When a people have come to a state where they make no effort to reform their religious estate, their condition forebodes calamity. In times of extreme excitement, in the clash of national interests, in the conflict of classes, in the animosities bred by political corruption, the greatest solvent is the common religious faith controlling the consciences of the masses. Settled religious convictions, freely accepted, intelligently and voluntarily propagated, with such hold on the community as to control the personal life, give firmness and character and balance to all social forces, and they give security in times of extreme political stress. Religion is the balance-wheel of the social machinery.

Across the English Channel another state of things attained through the whole reformative period as well as in later religious changes. Voltaire led the French intellect into a revolt against a corrupt Church, and the revolt was never able to distinguish between the representative of a thing and the thing itself. In England there was the free mental movement, but there was a contention for ethical and religious values.

There was revolt against the hollowness of an Establishment, and at the same time there was a change for the better in the moral and intellectual atmosphere of English thought. The English mind never lost faith in the base of religion; and it occurred, therefore, that the popular pulse was none the less effective against the hollowness and show of a State Church in the fact that it was less violent. The Wesleys and Whitefield went over England, preaching duty to God and man, and quickening the moral and spiritual forces among the common people, and allowing all questions of civil right, so far as their work was concerned, to take care of themselves. They were successful in touching and lifting large numbers of the neglected and disturbing classes, and by this sort of work, largely, the social problem for England was solved. But France, in the throes of deliverance from not only a dead but corrupt establishment, came by way of bloody political hate and revolution rather than religious reform. In the first stage of revolt against ecclesiasticism on the part of the French people, if there could have come to them a vital and real religious awakening, like that which came to the German provinces in the days of Luther, and with this, as a sure result, reform in religious practices, it would have no doubt secured them against the pathetic history of a century of carnage and dishonor. At the opening of the Revolution, the preaching of a pure gospel would have

infused the life of moral energy into the activities of society. If this had been chosen as the course, it would have been easier of achievement than that which did follow—a turning from the cold, shivering regions of a dead Church life, and finding no stopping-place until the cold, shivering regions of agnosticism had been reached.

God does not dominate human reason. He suffers human ambition and passion to take their courses. He expects the race to become wiser in its own history. In England the work of the Dissenter gave new and vivid impulse to the stability of English institutions. In France there was no such force as this moderative law of voluntary religious agency, and the Revolution rushed blindly into the proclamations and measures that brought with them the saddest consequences.

We have aimed to give the reader here a page of French history. The world can not afford another like it. It may be well to take into account the danger of its repetition in America. Like social manifestations will never be present in America as in France, because an American is not a Frenchman. Still the decay of the religious life will have practically the same social consequences everywhere. The religious impact must have expression and life as the strongest guarantee against social disturbance and social disintegration. Christianity is the religious system of the American people. If the religious life here becomes a matter of Church membership simply; if it comes to pass

that it has nothing of sacrifice or self-denial in it; if the commandments are counseled only when convenient; if the old questions of duty to God and man become mere abstractions; if we have not the courage and the strength to throttle social corruptions in self-preservation; and, above all, if the example of professors becomes such that the popular mind loses respect for it, and by that fact is put out of reach of the gospel plea,—we may then begin to write Ichabod over the portals of the Nation.

V.

GERMANY, ITALY, AND MEXICO.

THE intense and hot antagonisms of French history have not been common in Germany, because not natural to the German mind and spirit; but the religious question has always been first in importance to the German people. Into the sources of the Christian life, and into the credibility of the Scripture records, and into the laws of interpretation, there has been more research on the part of German scholars than on the part of any other people. The growth and power of rationalism itself signifies that the questions with which it deals are of supreme interest and moment. German skepticism is farthest from declaring that the fundamental problems of life shall be regarded with indifference, because all questions with reference to them may not be clearly answered. We have no space in this volume to discuss the phases of German belief, although they have some bearing on our theme.

With this opening thought that religion, to the German mind, has always been of significance, we take only space to express some of the reasons for the unsatisfactory state of things in the organically related civil and religious forces.

1. It has produced clerical indifference to the

saving of souls arising out of a support that has little or no relation to the work done.

2. There is the feeling on the part of the people that, as the State has charge of religious interests, if the stipend is paid, there is release from the obligation of personal work.

3. It has taken from the Church an essential quickening of its life, that of its perpetuity depending on the piety and faithfulness of its members.

4. Its tendency has been constantly to separate the clergy from the people, and destroy that mutual fellowship so necessary to success.

5. The State Churches are helpless before the wandering masses who attend the beer-gardens, and any sort of consistent Christian life is the least of their thought.

It is of general experience that the religious forces, when armed with the secular authority, cease to be the friends of liberty. What would be the nature of the rule of a religious life which has been nurtured in the free air of liberty, we can not tell. We have no case of the kind, nor are likely to have, and we have less need than we have likelihood that the case will appear; but through the whole of Christian history tyranny has followed ecclesiastical rule so uniformly, that the air of liberty in the modern world is producing so strong revulsion against it that its domination is being shaken off in many places.

Italy, the home of the pope, and almost the

last to proclaim independence for its social forces, seeing the tender and delicate and, perhaps, dangerous relations which the civil power still holds to the resident of St. Peter's, issues occasional manifestoes to all Italian citizens, to take extra care to remain within the limits of civil regulations; but reflexively the manifestoes mean that while the Church shall not be unduly irritated, civil supremacy will be maintained at all hazard. The war of generations has engendered hates that affect all interests. In a recent demonstration in Italy the populace shouted: "Down with the clergy!"

In Mexico the civil power has not only claimed freedom, but has crushed the ecclesiastical, after it had for generations successfully pushed its unnatural claims for dominion in things secular. In 1852 the Romish clergy of Mexico numbered five thousand, with an annual income of eight million dollars; and one-half of the real estate was in its hands. In 1873 the State divorced itself, and confiscated the property of the priesthood and converted it largely to secular uses.

The secular spirit wrought to such measures is a very fruitful field of unbelief. It quickly becomes antagonistic to all forms of belief. It tolerates religion, and then ignores it. It produces unfriendly legislation toward the most healthful religious forces. It takes frequent occasion to drive the plowshare of human authority through the most tender and sacred of human interests.

While ecclesiastical supremacy breeds these thousand ills, the State supervision of religious interests has always been a failure. It invariably brings the results enumerated, as plainly apparent among the German people. In every form of organic union between the civil and religious forces the people have been like Issachar, bound between two burdens and sorely oppressed. The whole world now has learned this, though it has been an expensive lesson; and the tendencies of all human forces now are toward the widening and expansion, and toward the free movement of both social and religious forces. To these tendencies in American history we shall address ourselves in the next chapter.

VI.

CIVIL AND RELIGIOUS FORCES IN THE UNITED STATES.

AMERICA was not discovered or settled until about such time as the largest consequences thereby should accrue to the cause of liberty and religion. For generations before knowledge was had of these shores, the social and religious conditions in Europe were such as to hinder the principles of self-government and the free evolution of religious agencies. These conditions made it desirable that a new land be made the receptacle of the best the world had known until then. The best the world knew as to government and religion it had never been able to apply. How could any European territory become the place for the total separation of the religious and secular forces when the tangled complications of the centuries were about it? One of the disadvantages of a civilization as it gets older is the increasing clog to its life and power, brought about by effete social and religious pliancies that persist in holding their places. Established forms are always conservative, and they always resist supersedence or overthrow. The infallibility of what has been—the infallibility of custom—this was the hindrance to the highest and best things;

and a new country was needed to furnish a free atmosphere for the growth by transplanting of the greatest things that man had learned about himself and his government—about Deity and his government. And to this end there appears to be the intelligence of design in the time of the discovery of this country. If it had been discovered and settled even two hundred years before it was, it would have been occupied by a people whose .race affinities, whose domestic ideas and religious beliefs, were so far different from those who did settle here, that even from the ruins of that which they would have established the American Republic could never have been built. As it was, the seeds of the apostolic idea were hardly ripe when they were first transplanted. During the time of the Colonial settlements, the greatest embodiment of transatlantic thought was the legalized connection between the social and religious powers. The germs for the state of things which now exist appeared to come to vitality largely among the Colonists after they had reached America. The spirit of religious freedom which, in the final resolve, must deal fairly, was, more than any other, the nurturing force of that which we now see. Only the unassimilated conditions of the American idea could have been in the minds of the first settlers; for they knew nothing but to perpetuate the old order of things. The Puritans came to be free; but they were intolerant because more than one form of worship to be

recognized was to them inconceivable. They knew no other way for the support of religion except from the public treasury. They had very crude notions of the standards by which the American people now judge them.

The Jamestown type of Colonies was planted largely under the conviction that the highest functions of the English Government was to propagate the gospel. Among these early settlers there was an Establishment, because that was written in and provided for in their charters. So matters went on for a period. By and by the time came for federation for purposes of protection from the increasing warlike spirit of the Indians, for commercial advantages, and for protection against the encroachments of the mother country. In the first federative acts, the separate Colonies could each have an Establishment, and conserve what it considered to be the essential unity of its civil and religious work. But new difficulties arose. To make dissenters out of a majority of the Colonists by recognizing some one of their several forms of faith meant practically the dismemberment of the confederation; and an Establishment could not be made out of Church-of-England folks, and Baptists, and Quakers, and Puritans; so out of the necessities of Colonial history came the practical American idea, as out of the necessities of the late war came the Proclamation of Emancipation. Only one thing ap-

peared possible in the final federation, and that was to give the social compact solidarity on a secular basis, and preserve simply the equilibrium of the religious forces without formal action concerning them. They builded wiser than they knew. Cortez came to America in search of Eldorado; he found it in this great country. The Colonists came over to found a Zion; they succeeded, but not in the way they thought.

It will be remembered, also, that the Revolution accomplished for the Colonies more than independence. It gave freedom from the established forms of Europe, both political and religious. It produced naturally a strong opposition to English methods and ways. The Revolutionists preferred an untried path rather than to ape the people from whom they had wrested their liberties. It was something more than a coincidence, therefore, that started the opposition to the organic relation of civil and religious affairs in this country.

"In November, after the Declaration in July, Maryland made a Declaration of Rights, with a purpose to dissolve all civil relation with the Church. In December a dissolution was effected in Virginia. The same thing occurred soon after in the Carolinas. Forty years afterward the Congregational State Church of Connecticut was abolished; and, lastly, Massachusetts cut away the last excrescence of State support of religion."

Dr. Philip Schaff says: "The United States presents a new phase of the history of the relation of the two powers." He is certainly mistaken. Our position is exactly that of the apostolic times. In a journey of eighteen centuries, the course of religious history has, through great victory indeed, but over perilous ground, made a complete circle, and, for the first time since the departure, we are in the apostolic succession.

Civil and religious forces are not organically related in the United States. Each pursues an independent course in its own sphere. The religious life, having to do with spiritual things, has free course in all that pertains to the kingdom of heaven. The civil power, having to do with social affairs, controls in all the functions that belongs to civil governments; and this is not among us regarded as an expression of the American theory simply. It is, without doubt, a structural distinction in the questions that pertain to the social and spiritual economy of the race—distinctions which do not change as the generations come and go. They may be modified, they may find new forms of expression, but at bottom they are forever the same, and the natural outworking of either system can not be interfered with, without detriment to society as a whole. It is our thought that the American system accomplishes the end of non-interference and of free working the most complete in history.

THE SPHERE AND LIMITATION OF HUMAN SOCIETY.

It is a favorable fact that while our fundamental law does not establish religion, it voices the purpose to make the religious the peer of all other inalienable rights. Our legislation in this respect is not an antagonistic movement; it is not rebellion against the authority of conscience or man's instinct for religion. It simply expresses the principle that all questions involved in the term religion lie beyond the competency of civil rulers. The attitude of the civil power toward the religious life is simply a recognition of the right of its existence, which is, reflexively, a recognition of the fact that the kingdom of Christ is not a kingdom of this world, and that it can not healthfully be complicated in any way with the administration of civil government.

Dr. Curry says: "The government as such is neither religious nor irreligious, because it is held that it is not among the functions of the State to intermeddle with such things. If it be pleaded that without the influences and restraints of religion society could not be held together, that the continued life of society is conditioned on the religious sentiment of the people, even that may be granted, and yet it may be claimed that the best possible method for rendering that influence effective is to leave it to the individual and to the social influences to which it gives rise."

The lawyers frequently say of the two systems there is no relation at all. A statement not true in any strict sense. The civil forces have relationship to all bodies within their jurisdiction. The relationship in this case is not that of obligation or authority to teach religion, because that would involve authority to impose doctrinal opinion and spiritual regulations on the life. No such idea has ever pervaded our institutions. Our civil system has never had anything to do with the final future. It has in it the prospective element, but it is confined to the conditions of this life exclusively. The right of worship is recognized as equal with the right of liberty, and by the act the State expresses as much faith in the reality of worship as in the reality and value of liberty. The social compact has no theory further than this, and its interest in these and all other things is its interest in itself. Whatever realities may be arrived at through the abstract conceptions of either religion or liberty, are matters with which civil society does not concern itself; but because of this it does not take a skeptical attitude or an attitude of negation. The non-committal attitude of the civil powers concerning the pliancies and forms of religion, can not by any process of fairness be interpreted as indifference to the thing itself. In its own interest, a self-protective and a self-preservative interest, the social order makes room for religion. This is so, reasonably, because it is for its life dependent on religion. M. Saisset

says: "A society from which religion is banished is an impossible society."

Ex-President Woolsey says: "If religion is judged to be essential to the well-being of the community, the State may provide for anything that appears for the religious order and worship." Whether it was believed by Mr. Woolsey that the civil community might provide for the religious order of worship without establishing a religion, does not appear; but manifestly to have such a right granted is a sort of work of supererogation. Civil society need never look after the expression of the religious instinct. It can take care of itself. Of the two it has always been the stronger in history. All society need do now, in times of civil supremacy, is to give free course to religion. There has seldom been a case where it became necessary to establish religion. Religion, we have already shown, is persistently self-assertive and self-perpetuating. Religious potentials have always been as strong as political potentials. The fact is, man's outward social life never organized religion, nor did his religious life ever institute society. The sources of either of these forces are not in the other.

THE SPHERE AND LIMITATIONS OF THE RELIGIOUS LIFE.

Organized religious agencies have a right to their influence, but it is not within their province to act on society as a corporate whole. Religion,

as illustrated in the individual character, and not through organic relationship, becomes the salt of society. The hopes of eternity put into the common virtues of citizenship strengthen them a hundred-fold. The services of the religious life to society are simply incalculable; and they are all the more salutary because they are rendered in the region of the voluntary forces, from whence the greatest elements of strength come to the character. The religious life is a social power, because it plies its benign influences on the sources of all strength and all authority and all order. The greatest stay and prop to any set of civil institutions is the work accomplished in the moral and religious life by those who are called Christians. So, then, the hope of civil society is that the religious life among a people may be left free to work in its own sphere, that it may not be hampered by civil regulations or strictures. And also the hope of the faith-life of a people is that it may not clip from its own brow the crown of glory by any species of abdication in the spiritual realm, hoping thereby for greater things in the realm of the secular forces. The weapons of the Christian life are spiritual. It must not use any other. A true Church will not, under any circumstances, use outward force to accomplish its own ends. This would be to assume a work not given to it in its establishment. It has no direct jurisdiction in the administration, or even the organization, of the civil forces. It must do its own

work in its own way, and when faithfully performed it will never complain of lack of influence.

There are easy ways of having men outwardly conform to the regulations of the spiritual life. There is a fascinating sort of institutionalism which may be made to take the place of the personal soul reaching for another soul, and these two reaching for a third, and lifting it from the mire. There is a deceit that frequently cheats a Church-life out of its value to the community by inducing it to come down from the high domain of its spiritual power, and turn its attention as a whole to the change of civil administrations or the control of policies. For the Christian life the sovereignties are within. Christ says so.

VII.

DELICACY OF THE POISE BETWEEN THE SECULAR AND THE RELIGIOUS FORCES.

AFTER more than a hundred years of successful history, in which many States have been added to the Union; in which new synods and associations and conferences have been organized, and the whole land under voluntary enterprise dotted with churches; a period in which man's civil life has had its largest expression, and his religious life its most glorious development, we are coming on the border of days which may lead to perplexing complications. There are evidences of confusion in the multitude of issues before us. The relations between the religious life and the civil life in this country are becoming so intricate and so vital that *we fail to distinguish between the purely political and purely moral and spiritual phases of the same questions as they appear.* Political and religious ideas in certain regions have come into confusion. Grave questions in reference to them are yet to be settled. At present there is much clashing and strife.

In a general way, it does not require close observation to see distinctions in the terms morals, religion, politics.

Largely all questions of State are of a political nature; but the fundamental features of every just government are not political so much as ethical. A just State is founded in morals. At the bottom of human society, as of all intelligent government, are the fundamental distinctions of the good desert of virtue and the ill desert of vice. These are primal facts in all systems of intelligent control.

In addition to this, also, we of the Christian faith believe that we can make a reasonably strong defense of the position that ethical laws have at least their sufficient authority in religion. So among the undercurrents there is an interdependence and blending

In this connection the following questions appear:

1. How far may the Church go in the advocacy of methods and agencies for the social welfare, and how broad may its work become before it reaches the field of politics?

2. How much may the State undertake in strengthening ethical values without encroaching on the domains of the religious life?

The relations of these two systems of forces are just here somewhat tender. There are intimations, as our people are becoming better conditioned, that the Church-life of this country is getting more or less weary of the old way of the gospel, and occasionally, in the name of its own goodness, it is giving advice to the politician and

the law-maker, which may be good enough and necessary enough, but which smacks of dereliction of Christian duty.

And there are signs that this secular spirit may become insolent and harsh toward its spiritual sister; and with occasions to intensify its spirit a few degrees, it would become positively a despotic force. There are instances already on our statute-books of unfriendly legislation toward existing religious forms. In political and legislative circles there is now more or less of contempt of Church-life. The common public temper is now frequently of such character that it answers the pulpit with an ethical code of its own, which says: "Wrong is that which I have no mind to, and right is that which I am inclined to." Are not the conditions such in this country that the civil and religious forces are in danger of being thrown into antagonism? We do not desire to raise a premature alarm, or become frightened over sporadic and abnormal things, but the writer has certainly seen in the movements about him some things which make him anxious that the lines between the civil and religious spheres be clearly drawn, that the American people may be able to apply more definitely the accepted policy of non-interference and mutual friendship.

But how can these systems or their advocates quarrel when they are so mutually helpful and dependent? I do not know how; I know brothers and sisters quarrel. I know the sad history of

these forces. Nearly the whole of it has been strife without understanding. I know that the condition in Europe to-day is that of the grip of civil supremacy. I have many evidences that the old romanistic conditions of South America are yet to breed revolutions. And I can not believe that the problem is fully solved in America. I believe that many of the best-intentioned people in this country are pursuing policies that, if successful, will bring us into fearfully evil times. It will not take an extreme agitation to array the civil and religious systems of this country against each other, and it is useless to contend with the intelligent reader that such an array means National peril.

The danger of which we speak is not the ordinary opposition to the religious life, which is known as the "offense of the gospel," and grows out of the resentment of the unregenerate heart to the strictures of a holy life. This opposition is usually without system or organization. It is strong at times; then it vacillates, and is without plans; and, in the face of healthful gospel forces, finally surrenders. The evil of which we speak grows out of the old misunderstandings. It has become almost a question of heredity. The greatest sorrows of the world have come out of this clashing.

I think it can be said that in this country there is an undeclared yet premeditated resistance against any Church-life, or any of the formal

religious bodies figuring in the direction of the political expediencies. This frequent intrusion of the ecclesiastical life, this offishness of the political spirit, and its frequent and sometimes uncalled-for assertion of supremacy, is not at all a favorable sign. There must be a better understanding. The two systems must not come into antagonism. They must neither assume to do the work of the other. They must not give each other too much advice. They must neither withdraw from the work. They must mutually help and support each other, for they are complements each of the other in the work of successfully governing this world. Toward the practical solution in American history of this supreme and still unsolved problem of the ages we devote the remaining pages of this volume.

VIII.

THE SECULAR AND ETHICAL SPIRIT IN THE PUBLIC SCHOOLS.

GREAT and permanent things come through slow and toilsome processes. They come through large and persistent expenditure of time and thought and personal effort. This, in short, is what human progress is. It is a great law of life, and it were unwise in any generation to expect immunity from it. The advantages which the mass of men at this age have received from intellectual culture are not in themselves vital or dynamic; that is, they are not self-perpetuating or self-purifying. The neglect or carelessness, therefore, of a single generation with reference to this or any other inheritance or possession, means a loss which the future must make up in some way or other. There is no lack of interest in educational work now, but, without speaking largely in disparagement, it can doubtless be seen that there are a few unnatural currents running through our educational life which, for a time, may hold us in bondage to a few errors. The work of education now touches the life men are living on so many sides, that we are frequently unable to see our way clearly with reference to some influences, and we are not able to follow out the consequences

of our own work, because we do not recognize the consequences of some of it, having had intention toward other things.

We have a way of regarding our public-school system as a sort of independent entity in our National life of so large proportions, under such headway, and so thoroughly equipped that it will not be shaken or fail to accomplish more than the American dream for it. It is indeed great. It sways the popular heart now. It is the full-blown flower of the ages. But shall we not look at it? Shall our patriotism become blind? Shall it bear grapes of Eshcol or the bitter fruit of Sodom?

As we shall undertake to show, the public schools hold a critical place between the civil and religious forces in this country. The first amendment ever made to the Constitution of the United States was that Congress should make no law concerning an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof.

Three things appear in that act: 1 Religion is recognized as an existence and to stay; 2. Religion is impaired and injured by an Establishment; 3. The affairs of State can be better administered by being wholly free from the complications that would be brought about by the acceptance and civil nurture of any of the creeds. This amendment was made as an after-thought, to protect the newly-born Nation from the old evils of State-Church conditions; and it was made in

the face of the clearest evidences that the religious life of the country was sufficiently self-contained to carry on its own work without fetters and without endowment. The American Government, without being committed to the advocacy of the Christian life in itself, is in favor of the principles of Christianity. It recognizes religion as an individual right—a Constitutional right, guaranteed just as personal liberty is guaranteed. Christianity, as a system, is recognized in the sense that the law securing a right recognizes the legitimacy of that right. The Government, being fully committed to the protection of the rights of worship, could not, under any possible normal condition, be indifferent to the spirit of worship among the people. Religious rights in the world's formulated codes are as fully and firmly expressed as any other, and these rights are established in a sense quite distinguished from an Establishment. The Constitutional amendment feature was, apparently, the first thing that appeared to the fathers of the Republic after they saw that neither civil nor religious authority centered any longer in the king of England. The two systems were brought under the necessity of looking each other in the face, and of coming to some understanding as to their relations to each other; and, without entering into bonds, they agreed to become friends, mutually interested and identified with each other.

Human government, as expressed in the last

chapter, has for its base two principles—the ill-desert of vice and the good-desert of virtue. There can be no stable government built on any other base. So human government, having an ethical base, and religion also being indissolubly bound to the moral life, makes the religious and the secular overlap in the region of morals. When, therefore, the religious and the civil come together in the field of morals, they undertake to work at the same thing at the same time, approaching it from different sides.

The system of ethics in our civil codes is substantially the same as that taught in the Word. One teaches ethics to the end of good government; the other teaches ethics to the end of eternal felicity. It would appear to the looker-on that there need be no antagonism; but there is confusion if not conflict, and in no place more apparent than in the public schools.

It happens that the Bible contains the Ten Commandments, and around them has culminated a moral code which has made such headway in the world that men can not now get along well without it. And because of this, there are not a few minds in great trouble about it, as a fact in relation to the Constitutional amendment. They have not thought themselves through. They are opposed to Sunday laws and chaplaincies and the Bible in the public schools because we have proclaimed religious freedom. We have concluded, they say, to legislate neither for nor against any

religious sect or party. The modicum of reason in this plea disappears when it is considered that whatever of the Bible is found operative in civil life does not therein find its reason and authority in the fact that the Bible is inspired, but on the basis of its natural right and utility to carry forward the purposes of the social compact. Christian practices which find their support from the civil arm base their right of existence and enforcement on natural and not on revealed principles. The State makes use of the moral influences of the Church, and grants certain guarantees and immunities, not because the Church has a divine right to live, not because of any special belief concerning it on the part of those who constitute the Church, but because the Church as such is an economic principle. Whatever of the Christian life has entered into these civil affairs can be justified on philosophical and legal principles.

As a text-book of moral principles, in harmony with man's native sense of such things, as a matter of fact, there is no book to supersede the Bible. There is no manual of duty so broad and plain. To object to it because of its claim to inspiration, is to carry the argument too far. For the practical efficiency of its moral teaching the State need not have the theory of its inspiration. It need have no theory whatever. Teach it in the name of the inherent right of its moral principles. Shall we blot from the statute all larceny laws because the Bible says, "Thou shalt not steal?"

Shall we cease to legislate on the high crime of murder because there is a command, "Thou shalt not kill?" Those who would put the civil life beyond the majestic sweep of Bible thought, would remove from society the great natural fountain of its laws and its moral necessities, and would turn the world back on its hinges a thousand years.

In the schools the State can teach ethics severed from theology; that is, minus theology. It can give moral instruction in the name of its practical utility. And at the same time we can see that the problem which the secular spirit has proposed to itself—that of divorcing theology from morals—will never be solved, because, in the nature of things, they must stand or fall together. On account of the delicacy of the civil poise toward religious matters, the theologic relationships of the moral life can be trusted to the operation of the voluntary religious forces. Ethics may be taught by the State from the side of its social utility, yet the efficiency of that teaching always needs to be re-enforced from its theological side through the home and the Church.

Morality in the public schools can not be taught from its dogmatic side without a clash with the Constitution, and also with the genius of our institutions. Morality, however, has nearly always lacked the power of ultimate enforcement, unless strengthened by the authority of the will of God. Right conduct is not customary conduct. It is not the conduct which consults alone the expedi-

encies or the best policies. The standard of human conduct is not the consensus of human opinion; such as may take on it new forms with the waves of passion, or such as may be menaced by inclination, or changed by the conventionalisms of society. Right conduct is gauged by the balance of God hung out over the ages. Men may be below the standard, they may not be able to understand it, but they will never be able to change it. The application of the moral code to the race is an evolution. The code itself involves the immutable distinctions of right and wrong, and it is as changeless as any first principle of the divine government.

That our plans and theories for public education should aim at the safety of the State through good citizenship, will command the assent of all reasonable people without argument; but good citizenship depends on good character, and good character depends on conscience. There can be the development of the mental forces into one-sidedness, and that one-sidedness will always appear where the day-schools do not take the care of character.

It has been insisted that moral training shall be relegated to the home and the Sunday-school. The difficulty of such a procedure is that a child can not be analyzed and divided, and the different departments of its nature let out in job-lots to the different agencies for child-culture; one part to the home, another to the day-school, and another to the college. Character must be built as the child

grows, or when we come to put the child together under the skillful hand of a teacher of the new school we will have what science dreads, "a catastrophe." Character-building must be done in every-day life, and piecemeal. It must be the constant growth of human life. To develop the intellectual faculties to the neglect of conscience is to undermine the foundations of the civil order. For the public to seek the mental acumen of its citizens, or to have them skilled in the arts and sciences and in literature, and to see them awakened to invention and discovery, and to become great in material resources and dead to the finer instincts of moral feeling, is to find itself soon powerless for advancement. Material progress and culture are agencies of destruction to a people dispossessed of practical virtues. A national life is lost as soon as it starts down the grades of morality.

It has been contended that the moralities are instinctive, and will take care of themselves; that man's inward sense of what is right in human relations needs no bracing or cultivation; that it remains perpetually operative, and will fill its uses without attention.

Unfortunately, as a matter of fact, the reverse of this statement is true. Human history is almost an unbroken experience of the perpetual struggle of the moral life and of frequent decay. With line upon line of instruction and admonition, that which appears as the possible ideal of

moral living has never been attained by the mass of men.

Truth is like a great temple having many entrances. It can be approached from many sides. Our littleness is, we reduce the entrances to one or two and discard the others. Shall we shut out the truth from any avenue? Shall the human mind be kept away from the divine mind? Shall it be careless of all the truth involved in human responsibility? Truth has largeness, it has inclusiveness. The time has come for more room, more freedom. Truth ought to be intolerant of error, not intolerant of other truth. "Shall the foot say, Because I am not the hand, I am not of the body; is it therefore not of the body? And if the ear shall say, Because I am not the eye, I am not of the body; is it therefore not of the body? If the whole body were an eye, where were the hearing? If the whole were hearing, where were the smelling? The eye can not say to the hand, I have no need of thee; nor again the head to the feet, I have no need of you."

The preacher is unwise if he rants when the scientist, with a sure conclusion, spoils his interpretation of a text. So the scientist ought to possess his soul in patience even after he sees he can not whistle theology down the wind.

Our schools are not necessarily godless because the Bible is not used as a text-book; and if the ethics of the Word be taught therein, it does not form the ground of an accusation that religion is

established. The advocates of the complete secularization of the schools forget that if there is an officially proclaimed neutrality as to Christian morals; if even there is a positive refusal to postulate the existence of Deity as the ground of moral obligation,—there is therein a negation of theism which is atheism, which is a theological dogma and tenet of the clearest character. Why, therefore, should negative criticism have a veto over positive Christian thought? Any theory which excludes the idea of God is assumptively a denial of his existence, which is atheism. What right more has atheism than Christianity? Granted that it is a difficult and delicate matter so to adjust the civil affairs of a great people that they will never come into rasping relationship with morals and religion, and with those who believe in no religion,—might it not come to pass that the only sensible thing to do would be to give preferences to the majority? It is out of harmony with the American spirit to put questions of conscience to the test of the majorities; but might there not be two sides to a question of conscience, and would it not be eminently unrepublican that the conscience of the minority should control the conscience of the majority in case of a condition where one or the other must be chosen? We put this proposition against any assumed right of the minority, or, in other words, against negative criticism assuming a controlling voice in civil affairs, and not as an indorsement of the principle of con-

trol by a majority in matters of conscience and faith. We have in mind, all along here, the official provision of the State for ethical education. The lack of provision for such instruction is evident in many States of the Union. It is not a common affair for School Boards to make specific provision for instruction in morals, and this not because School Boards are enemies of good morals, or because they are indifferent, but because of their interpretation of the spirit of our institutions as involving them in the obligation to keep their hands off anything related to religion. The interpretation is an extreme one.

It is plainly to be seen that it is because of the indissoluble connection between religion and morals that boards of control hesitate to make specific provision for the ethical training of children. Do they fear that such provision will be taken as an establishment of religion? Religion is not morality, but it is built on morality. So is the State built on morality. The foundation is broad enough for both buildings, and when they are finished, therefore, they are likely to have unity of architectural design. Religion for its life can not leave morality; neither can the State. Then why this offishness? The attitude reminds us of two farmers living side by side, with adjoining lands, and who have been so careful of trespassing on each other's territory that several rods of brush and weeds have grown up on either side of the line between them.

There is no definitely drawn line in the popular mind between the civil and religious forces. They are not at a full understanding. They are not in antagonism, and not in harmony. Our National history has been such that our people have not been able to get a clear idea about moral conduct as related to the civil administration on the one hand and to religion on the other. Whether a child is saved in the next world or not, is none of the State's business; but whether it be saved in this life is a State concern. An honest, sober, industrious citizenship is essential to the life of the commonwealth; so the State ought to have no qualms about teaching that which it requires of its citizens. Morality, plain and simple, can certainly be taught without making it a pendant of the Nicene Creed. The State might even take recognition of religion as it relates to the social well-being, deal with it, use it, and encourage it as a social force, and that without making it an Establishment. In so far as religion has its social utilities, it may be encouraged. Then can the civil and religious forces be at such outs about the moralities? May they not meet and talk it all over?

Man's ethical life has its base in the human constitution, and can not be ignored, and there is something in it that inevitably leads to the idea of God; and yet it is possible that ethics may be taught and enforced in human society without any social indorsement of the God idea in it. So there may be that much of adjustment to the civil

rights of the freedom of faith. Man has natural relations to right and wrong, to good and ill desert, to the approval and the sting of conscience; and, without going any further, these natural relations may be incorporated into political forms, and be executed in the name of the State, and they may remain the guarantees of its perpetuity.

And from the religious side, without interference with all or any of this, there comes the further inference and belief that this nature of man is a product of a wisdom above him, and reveals the existence of an infinite intelligence. If it be true that morals pulled out of the soil of the doctrine of God's being are shorn of their authority, it is in the order of things that religion, by methods always at command and always effective, should impress the morals of the Nation with the God idea, and let the State continue to administer morals in the name of their utility. Will not all interests then be conserved, and all movements be healthful? Is not this clearly the way in which religion is to impress its value on society, by thus furnishing it with the sources of its power?

Every student of history and every statesman will agree that, unless we can purify as we lift and enrich, we are only building our palaces and cultivating our acres, and increasing our population and resources, that moral anarchy and night may overtake and destroy us. The combined forces of wealth, and philosophy, and culture, and

science will not save a nation from floods of corruption. These strong and seething currents of life which now traverse these States and congregate in these cities, can only be secured for a prosperous future by the most careful and painstaking attention to that supreme force recommended by the Father of our Country in his Farewell Address. The virtue of a people is its safeguard in times of danger, above all its civil laws and all its armies.

Let us not receive the idea, however, that there is no moral training in the public schools of the country. On the contrary, great things are being done. There is no higher character in the land than our public teaching force. Our millions of children are tutored under as broad manhood, under as pure and strong womanhood, as the Nation affords; and as long as the individualizing of the teacher's labor is not interfered with, no menace will come from our public-school work; but the fact remains that there is not sufficient recognition given to ethical training, because it has never been thoroughly grafted into the curriculum of the schools. United States Commissioners of Education make reports on State departments of university work, agricultural colleges, public high-schools, normal schools, kindergarten work, teachers' institutes, schools for deaf and dumb and blind, schools of refuge, scientific schools, law schools, medical schools, but nowhere in the list a department of ethical instruction.

Commissioners of schools have not distinguished between the functions of State and Church and family so as to do large things for morals. They have aimed to be practical and safe on Constitutional grounds, rather than to put into the work of child education that which every sane man knows must not be neglected.

The work of moral education needs to be systematized through the years of a child's school-life, and it needs to be done in a way that the child will not have the indefinable impression that it is being taught morals by rote. Goodness can be so presented that the child will love it. Reach the mind and heart, for instance, through choice selections from the world's literature, or through songs that are touched strongly with all emotions of the beautiful, the good, and the true; or through brief biographies setting forth the highest ideals of life, with occasionally a selection showing the consequence of sin. Let obedience, the highest law of life, have standing. Keep character in the foreground. Look out for applications from natural things to teach honesty and sincerity and integrity. Give advice naturally and with discretion; and if young America revolts, pour it into him in allopathic doses. The spirit most unwilling to take moral advice needs it most. That a child is never benefited by what it does not wish to hear is a great error. The moral faculties of a child are trained by use, as are the mental faculties; and the child should

have knowledge, in as large measure as possible, of the fact that he is under a system of moral law which he can not ignore without injury and pain.

The school-room should give opportunity for the development of a character which is making choice constantly of higher and higher motives. The highest purpose of the public training-school is to send out manly men, womanly women. The theory that the public schools and colleges have no work to do but to rifle the brain, to train the intellect, is not only false but vicious. It is said plants draw more of their actual substance from the air than from the soil. Among the things of an objective kind which are to shape the life, none is more potent than the atmosphere of the school-room. There may be in the school an unexpressed and indefinable yet healthful pulse for good; there may be a surrounding in which the child-heart is made glad without knowing why it is so; there may be a silent and mysterious power in the school-room to exalt any life that comes under its influence; will any citizen regard this as an unimportant matter—a thing that will take care of itself? It is indeed more important than erudition as ordinarily understood. This is a vital part of all erudition, and the life of the State is involved in it.

A child, somehow, has a marvelous recuperative power, by way of getting over or around, or stumbling through, lack of facilities for mental equipment in the school; but moral defects are by

far more calamitous. A teacher next to a child's parent has influence. From six till twelve the child's life may be molded and changed forever. Then is it out of the way that School Boards should openly declare in favor of Christian morals; that they should make provision for just such ethical training in the school as has been found necessary in the home, through direct instruction and admonition in all the practices and reliable principles of just living? Shall not my country, with a strong and steady hand, lay hold of this fountain of its citizenship, and mold the character as well as lead the mind of its youth into the fields of the knowledges?

IX.

GOVERNMENT BY WRITTEN LAW.

THE statutes of a free people are the general expressions of the will of that people as to human right; that is, the right of the individual as related to the whole. They constitute the expressed consensus of the social order. Legislative authority takes hold of custom and opinion, and formulates them into a written code. Statutory provisions are aimed to be the products of the popular will. They are born of opinion, sentiment, conviction, and they die of the same. Written laws can not add to themselves, can not perpetuate their force. They shift and decay with the change of opinion. They yield to the force of circumstances. Forms of law are evanescent. They take new cast and shape, and are controlled by the evolutions of social thought. The laws of a people grow out of a people. Neither the sources of the law, therefore, nor the kind of law, or the manner of its administration, is in itself. It was substantially expressed in the first chapter in this volume that the social order does not proceed from the king downward, but out of human instincts and out of man's necessities for government. No civil code of a people was ever enacted beforehand ready for use. It may express the na-

tional character; it never constitutes it. Legislative enactments do not mold a people. The reverse is nearly the uniform law of history. Tyrants have formulated codes in violation of human rights, millions have been oppressed, nations have been crushed and subjugated, but the procedure is the one by which tyrants are more frequently overthrown than otherwise. Even among the old monarchies, while not ostensibly, it was practically true that the manners, tastes, customs, and opinions of a people, in the long run, became the dominant forces. Tradition reports that the Greek laws under Lycurgus were fabulous. The probabilities are as strong that they were fabulous as that they were derived from first sources in himself. The fact is, he understood the political and social and religious drifts of his people. He conserved, formulated, eliminated, and brought out in succinct and clear form the Spartan law, which in itself was an evolution. Lycurgus was not a lawgiver; he was a law-formulator. The success of these ancient statutes was in the fact that they were in consonance with the spirit of the people, and they were suited to no other people or time.

It has been stated by a few swift students of history that the laws of Solon were copied into the Roman law; but while some of the principles of the two systems are identical—as in fact such identity may be seen in all codes—and while there are some parallels as to process of construc-

tion, the Roman law is distinctly Roman. Its spirit, its temper, its special and general regulations, were all drawn from Roman sources. Roman law came out from the Roman people, and, what is more significant, with all the efforts of early law-makers and magistrates to fix and make permanent the primitive Roman civil regulations, the law grew and expanded. It kept pace with popular necessity and custom, and we have now the Roman law as the complete expression of the civil life of the Roman people. Written laws may be put on parchment; they may be engraven in brass; they may have constitutional features, a condition which is supposed to give them the highest kind of permanency; but if in form and spirit they become effete, if a people outgrow their written statutes, the fountains of new statutory forms may be sealed for a time, but, like springs from the hills, they burst into expression.

In all civilized governments the sources of written law are directly in the people. They make or unmake ultimately whether they have any direct hand in it or not. How well the administrators of the law know that a misfit statute is nugatory, simply because it is a misfit! The reasons for a statute, and therefore the executive force of it, are in the conditions and necessities of a people as interpreted by their own estimates. This is why the enactment of legal forms which are not in harmony with the community's estimate of itself gives rise to disappointment.

We shall see more clearly the true force of written law when we remember that the legislation of a people is its instrument of control, to be obeyed, indeed, but not a sovereign force to be feared and dreaded. The value of a written expression of law among a people is for purposes of enlightenment, to the end that a common understanding and uniformity may be attained; but there is very much of public sentiment that need not be expressed in the law. The written law only needs be on a broad basis of principles, and in its highest form it can not be expected to descend to the expression of all human relations in such a complex life as ours. And, furthermore, any attempt to put into formal statute these complex relations would be to rob the individual of freedom. The citizen, under law, must have as large liberty for the free and full play of his powers as is consistent with the welfare of the whole body. It is the experience of lawyers that in all that class of legislation which descends to the regulation of the more minute and personal forces of the social compact, the law that is made to fit a special case in mind, and serve the end of justice there, in the main is more likely to come to applications which end in injustice.

It is not possible to express and include in statutes all cases that may come up for adjudication. The old English year-books were efforts at this. There is a growing theory that the best government is the one with the fewest laws, by

which is meant a state of things in which statutory forms are the embodiment of the general principles of human control, administered by the consensus of the whole body as to what is right and just in application. Any particular law, therefore, is ideal in that it plainly expresses a definite principle and provides for its enforcement. The expressed statutes, therefore, constitute a small part of the law of the land. There is a law of custom created by the habits of a people that will have precedence over a statute out of harmony with it. So there are significant features in the civil codes of a people which are not written, and in their very nature can not be written, but out of which, and for which, expressed statutes and constitutions are made.

So also many of the finer and more delicate relationships of human life are not the subjects of civil administration. They must be left to their free working under the individual conscience and the voluntary moral forces of the community. That which makes a citizen moral, that which makes him desire to follow his conscience and obey the numberless laws which are involved in his associations with his fellow-citizens, is not derived from the written statutes or any other sort of outside repressive pliancies. Man was moral before the law was made, and he must remain so afterward, or the law is of no force. What he is, the law is. Moral forces do not come from the statute. They are produced and executed

by its life; they are overthrown by its decay. Statute-books are frequently loaded down with laws to make men moral. These laws are always failures. To make men good by statute is to play at a farce. It is to mistake effects for causes. The civil law is primarily for the protection of human rights, and where that is done the limits of the civil authority are reached. The law enters into no agreement to pay a reward in this life or the next. By securing to all a common social right, it secures to each adequate protection for the full exercise of all faculties and powers which do not interfere with the common welfare. By this the natural freedom of the individual may be limited, and he receives no toastings or congratulations, but he has the means of happiness opened to him. He is simply given a chance.

Hence governments can not exercise paternity, the foolish dream of nearly all modern socialism. The State does not hold the relation to a citizen like that of a parent to a child. Human government was never exercised righteously in the spirit of paternity, except in those cases of the primitive time when the ruler was of blood-kin to all his subjects, and his oppressions were held in check by that fact. Civilization has outgrown this form, and can never return to it. The average citizen now can be taken out of leading-strings. He is sufficiently self-contained to stand alone, and sufficiently intelligent to know what he wants. As has been shown, the sources of

government are centered in the citizenship; therefore the outward form is subordinate to this citizenship, and plastic in its hands; and a citizenship which proposes to turn itself over into the hands of its own government, to be taken care of, is strangely forgetful of the sources of human control. The dream of socialism and of Mr. Bellamy is to lift one's self by one's boot-straps. With the decay of the power of self-purifying; with the fading of the force that gives efficiency to such laws as express the purpose to build and elevate and enlarge the body politic, there can be little hope of any benefit from turning things over to any sort of ideal outward forms. To expect that a government shall assume the rôle of a parent providing for children, and take general and particular charge of all things—own in its own name all the resources of its children, and issue rations periodically, and guarantee to all peace and plenty—is to expect that a machine of perpetual motion will work. Shall a scheme be invented to relieve the body of the processes of blood oxygenation and blood assimilation? When the body has no longer vitality to carry on the processes of breathing and animal nutrition, will it not die? Efficiency of the governing forces that have been embodied in the social compact, comes as a constant breath from the individuals which compose that compact. Impossible that a people should turn themselves over into the care of the compact! Any race for which this sort of

guardianship is necessary has come to the limit of its strength, and is looking around for a place to lie down to die.

Given the common benefits of society and civilization, and the citizen with mettle in him will make his way. He will not ask for special legislation in his behalf. The personal, moral, and religious obligations of any community-life must be the forces which give strength to the character, so that all legal expressions shall be executed. The quickening of the moral tone, the self-regulative honor of citizenship, the care of the poor, the voluntary sympathy which remains a force strong enough constantly to illuminate the number of the depraved masses,—these forces are not produced or perpetuated by the written law. For the civil law to be formulated with reference to taking charge of these powers, is to proclaim the new gospel that the millennial forces will always be found at the heels of the constable.

X.

THE VOLUNTARY MORAL FORCES

OF SOCIETY CONSTITUTE THE BASE AND STRENGTH OF ALL LEGISLATION ON ETHICAL QUESTIONS.

IF the insistance of the last chapter regarding the limitations and dependency of written codes be just; if formal law is only significant for that which is behind to produce and execute, the reader will see that the voluntary forces of the ethical and religious life of a people have important and vital functions,—so important, indeed, that the popular attitude of a community toward them determines the destiny of both. The voluntary social agencies are the leading ones. The battle for life, therefore, is with the social volitions in the field of morals. It is a battle of principles, which involves character. Lack of character means decay—first, in morals; last, but most certainly, in all the desirable products of civilization. When decay begins, therefore, what is the disease? Loss of character. How restored? By quick return to the bases from which it was built in the first place. This is a child's lesson; but God is insulted when old folks ignore it; and there is no record in history that he has ever permitted the success of short

and easy ways of building and making stronger the social bonds. There have been cases in history where, to keep the moral forces from immediate surrender and collapse, civil agencies have become their patrons; but each procedure has only for a short time postponed the crack of doom. In theory, a benevolent ruler, with full legal power, can bring about any needed reform with a breath; but, practically, he can do nothing of the kind, simply for the reason that the roots of sin go deeper than the plowshare of human authority, and the laws he may institute will become powerless, if not corrupt, before they reach the source of the evil. From this it may be seen that any general tendency to seek in legislation alone a panacea for moral ills is ruinous—a tendency which is never seen except it comes out of a sleepy and tired religious life and a decaying faith.

In a prosperous civilization one of the first evidences of weakness in the social bond is the advocacy of short and easy methods for the cure of social ills. It is seen first in a slow giving way of that strength of character which has kept moral truth in the foreground and brought a people to prosperity.

In the youth-time of a nation's life there is such a necessity that things become; there is the mastery of the rugged physical forces, sparse populations, lack of the means of luxury and of opportunity for ease,—all of which conditions are

builders of the sterner elements of character with which a young and growing nation is usually blessed. With a new people, after the governmental forms which they have established have gone beyond the period of experiment; after they have become successful in material concerns; after the blessings of a high civilization have come to them; after the father has been able to raise his son without labor, or at least without any of its severities, the father dies and the son becomes the author of an easy theory of life, easy methods of money-making, easy views of the social life, and the projector of easy methods for the cure of threatening social evils,—it is usually so that the second and third generations of a strong and prosperous people are under the fearful and fascinating temptation of believing that the wrinkles and frowns have all been taken out of the face of Providence, and that moral issues can be faced and satisfactorily settled in some other way than the old prosy way of resistance of sin, man by man, and a daily life of self-denial, man by man. A generation blessed with sterling virtues in human character, and these virtues, without formal declaration of an intention, having expressed themselves in social custom, in family government, in law, and in business, thus peace, prosperity, and glory flow from them as water flows from the springs in the mountain. And out of this generation of glory comes a crowd, who say: "This is good; we are the rich heirs of the genera-

tions." Theoretically, this crowd knows just how it all came about; but, practically, it will not undertake the manner of life, or that course of personal industry and virtue which will secure to the next generation the accumulated blessings of the past with the added ones of the present. The greatest there is in man socially tends to appear, in the first few generations, after he begins the ascent of political and national greatness. That he should be deceived and overwhelmed in his own achievements is the saddest fact of his history. Shall a man make a fortune, and thus take his seat, saying: "I have made you, now you take care of me and my generations?" The fortune is likely to be dissipated before his generations have a chance to crowd it.

A fortune is preserved by the same industry and economy and virtue by which it was made. Shall man build his civilizations, and then say to that which he has built: "Now you take care of me—preserve the increment of this progress, preserve and secure these intellectual and moral forces?" The civilization man builds for himself is a pitiful dependent. As soon as he lets go, it begins to fail—it goes to decay. The civilization which a generation has inherited and produced keeps that generation in the degree that it helps itself. Whenever any generation carries into execution the purpose to knock away the underpinning, to become regardless or indifferent to it, and swing to the superstructure, the

whole will fall. Civilizations are maintained by the same things that produced them. All national decay is in the forgetfulness of this one thing. Strength of personal character to obey the laws of its life, and to resist the self-destructions that have appeared in its pathway, has brought the Anglo-Saxon race to its present place in history. Whenever the Anglo-Saxon character shall conclude to lie down on this his product, the civilization about him, it will drop him to destruction. Shall man never learn this law of his history? Lack of knowledge or appreciation of this law has brought multitudes among us to ask of the social fortune they have made that it shall take care of them and theirs. For their purposes it must be self-perpetuating and inherently dynamic. It must transmute itself back into its own cause without destroying itself, and perpetuate its like for evermore. What consummate folly! Our fathers found no easy way of bringing the Nation into birth and into its present glory; and we shall find no easy way to perpetuate it. If that out of which nations are made and perpetuated is not in us, we have come to the end of our strength and achievement.

The first evidences of the loosening of character in a growing civilization are not physical or material, but moral. The love of money and the pride of life will urge on the energies of the outward life, and make out of it quite a show after the moral forces give signs of great weakening.

The virtues of life naturally, we think, are the first to give way under the temptations of luxury, and for this there is no cure but personal resistance. The remedy must be constitutional. The battle for the life of society under such conditions is in the character of the people. With the forces that build character is the security and the survival. Character among a people is not produced by the civil law. The civil law is produced by the character. The executive power of the law is in the voluntary forces which build character, and this character is impeached whenever the law is not enforced. Civil and statutory regulation, in a greater or less degree, may fence about; they may close the hatches, and lessen, in some measure, opportunities and temptations, but the shutting-off of these does not make men. We must have men before we can have desirable outside conditions. Men are made, not by statutes, but by such social forces as in themselves build character. The supremacy of ethical law would soon convince and persuade of its efficiency; and it would assuage the fanaticism and strife for particular statutory forms as being all-essential, by showing that the struggle for the life of society against the foes in its own bosom can, by no means, be successful by achieving even an ideal condition among secondary things.

When Englishmen were ripe for Magna Charta it came without effort, like a splendid vision, and it came to stay. When the slave problem of the

South had been wrought upon for generations by a thousand theorists, and when the dark days of the Rebellion were on, and a Nation was in the throes for life or death in a way we knew not, and in the exigency of an hour, the manacles fell from the black man's hands. Till that hour the Nation was not ready.

It will never do to lose faith in the moral order of the universe. The hidden forces in society are always the stronger. There is a kingdom which cometh not with observation. This is true of the evil as of the good. It is sometimes beyond the power of society to see just what lifts it. There are influences, like the fragrance of the flower, when given to the air, or like the light of the sun poured on the earth; there are zephyrs which cool the parched brow of society like the "wind that bloweth where it listeth; thou hearest the sound thereof, but thou canst not tell whence it cometh or whither it goeth." The blunder of political statesmanship has been its incapacity to estimate as a factor of sound political calculation the force of a healthy moral sentiment; but much of the political thought of the day is profoundly perplexed, only because it has not been instructed in the deeper causes of reform, and has never been able, therefore, to take much account of the only sure and satisfactory way of reforming great evils. The political reforms of England, which were led on by the elder Pitt, and were obstructed by Walpole, were born and received their momentum in

the religious revivals of Whitefield and the Wesleys. A sleepy State Church was awakened, the moral tone of the English people was elevated, Walpole went down, and Pitt came to victory through a power neither of them ever fully comprehended.

It is meet to remember that the growth of opinion to take upon itself higher forms is necessarily slow, and any attempt to coerce it into greater speed than the causes will permit is obstructive rather than helpful. The causes of social growth are largely immaterial. They do not present themselves to be made tangible—many of them may never have any sort of formal expression, because they have not been apprehended, except as an energy is understood, and yet they lead to momentous results.

It is certainly a misfortune that this swift-moving age gets impatient of these unseen and slow, yet tireless, forces of man's inward life. It gets uneasy of the counter-forces of a movement which appears so persistently to test every joint and ligament which binds society together. Man in the concrete is disagreeable and hard to manage; man in the abstract is glorious. Abstract philosophy is glorious. Finely-drawn theories are glorious. The objection to them is the only one that could be had to a machine of perpetual motion—they will not work. The laws of honorable living are not capable of a patent. They are eternal in their essence, and can not be improved on in any way except in the right way of individual

obedience. Conventions and caucuses shall not alter or abolish them. The world has no right to call any of them to judgment. They are the things that remain through all vicissitudes. Men may neglect, disobey, abolish, but they must take the consequences. They are administered by a government higher than that of any earthly institution—a government which sits in adjudication over all human arrangements. The moral issues are supreme among a people, because they lie at the base of the social order. If there is not in the social bond a magnet of force to attract strongly and steadily to the demands of the moral code, there is a social disintegration which no outward regulations can check. Professor Graham says: "All social remedies run up into moral considerations, and all necessary reform comes, as a matter of course, as men become morally better." Washington Gladden says: "This is the one truth we must not miss."

From the moral elevation of character comes the growth of conscience. Concience, related to society, becomes public, and on its healthful activity depends the peace and growth of society. If the public conscience in a popular government stands by and quietly submits to the operation of an inefficient law, or if it has not strength to move the popular will to execute a good law, there is something lacking in the public conscience. This, therefore, is the battle-field. The law-making and the law-abiding spirit is born from within.

It comes out of the healthful and well-regulated home; out of the knowledge of the principles of a just government; out of the quickening of the popular faith in divine things. Out of these comes the law-abiding spirit, which is worth more to any community than the authority of the State.

If a community silently sanctions whisky-selling, no law will ever stop it; if public opinion supports brigandage, the severest statutes will place but a small check to it. A statute is futile to create a sentiment or to execute itself. A statute carries out the will of the people, and frequently it is the means of carrying out that will rather than its own plain meaning. The governing power—that is, the legislative, judicial, and executive functions of government—has no independent power to suppress any acknowledged and general evil; and yet this is what it is for—this is its intention. It may be the purpose of the police force to suppress an insurrection, but the police will fail unless it has the help of the force that called it into being. Good laws and good officers frequently fail because the inherency of law, which is in the people and which constitutes the potential of good government, is lacking. When the power behind the throne has vigor in it, great things can be accomplished. To scold at the officers and the laws is to scold at one's self. Governmental forms have their practical limitations. To clamor at judges and legislators and executives because they do not always voice

the sentiment of the highest type of citizenship and political philosophy, is nonsense. In this country, if the masses are unwashed, the most delicate ethical distinctions need not be expected unless by those who expect to be disappointed. The sensible thing is to get the masses washed. Large undertaking! And who will do it? It is safe to say that conventions and party organizations and legislatures will not do it. There is not a case in history. Judges and sheriffs can not do it, because, time without date, they have been the creatures of the public mind. As a rule, and in the long run, whatever is in the public conscience will be voiced in the law and executed by the officer. Right home methods, right lines of popular instruction, right views of life, the spirit of the gospel,—these things will give us wholesome laws and just institutions, with all the guarantees of stable government. This may be old and the laughing-stock of those who desire another way; but there never has been any other way, and never will be. The individual, the home, the school,—the Church, these are the foundation-stones of the National structure.

A fevered patient is picking at the sheet that covers him. The difficulty is not with the sheet. The fever is all through that body. This world is set on fire with great destructives. All we see of a social ill is the hectic of a deep disease.

Our great cities are menaced with a congested population. Will municipal law, with the mayor

and a few pious aldermen, solve the problem of the American city? Never while the world stands. City populations do not need more regulation. Regulation has already put the majority into the gradgrind of destiny. These populations need lifting, morally, socially, intellectually. How? Unwilling spirits can not understand the agencies. The better-conditioned classes of the great cities were never more weary than now of the gospel blessing, "The poor ye have always with you;" and yet there is no present hope that these classes will ever be able to see that the agencies hitherto employed have been at fault because the conditions were absent. Love of truth, nobility of spirit, strong love of justice,—these must abide as real forces among a people, or outward regulations are no more than ropes of sand. The public virtue which every true citizen so greatly desires is only the prevalence of individual virtue. There is always forgetfulness of this great fact in the violent efforts that are frequently made to hedge about the commonwealth with safeguards, under the supposition that all danger comes from without. Dr. Buckley says: "Legislation, with the means of its enforcement, is only mighty when truth has prepared the way for it, and legislative acts are unimportant in the absence of the conditions and principles which both call them into existence and render them effective. Only as manhood is elevated will social conditions improve."

The moral atmosphere of a community is that

force in it which gives tone, strength, and temper to its administration. The theory that "moral suasion" is a helpless weakling is erroneous. Whenever public opinion comes to be more than mere sentiment, whenever it has a healthy moral sense behind it, those who participate and control in partisan spheres will quickly learn to defer to it. Public opinion in a free land, after all, is law. It is sure, sooner or later, to voice itself in statute; and there are instances where it has ruled before it received statutory recognition. By the moral sense of a community is not meant that weakly sentiment which has no strength. There is a moral suasion which makes laws and changes the course of things, and that "turns the world upside down." There is the moral suasion also of the goody-good, who goes to the saloon-keeper, for instance, and says: "Please, Mr. Saloon-keeper, won't you quit selling liquor?" Despicable! There is a moral suasion which says to him: "Get out of this business or get out of the community!" There is a peaceful little Quaker town in Indiana where the law grants the privilege of liquor-selling under conditions; but that quiet citizenship goes to the occasional new-comer in the liquor-business, and says to him, "Thee had better quit;" and he quits, because he had better. That sort of moral suasion will crush the life out of the liquor-business anywhere, and it will put an end to any open and dangerous social evil.

When Mayor Erwin, of Keokuk, Iowa, said

that "the saloon-keepers were willing that all the praying men of the city should wear out the knees of their pantaloons in prayer if they would not enforce the prohibitory law," he fell, with the saloon-keeper, into the fatal error that prayer was a farce; and he fell into the further fallacy that there might really be this intense and sincere prayer without an attempt to enforce the law. The fact is, if there are enough praying men at all in Keokuk to enforce the law, they will not wear out many pantaloons in sincere prayer before the work is done. The dead-shot of the Keokuk Christian's prayer would be that he would go and answer his own prayer. Religious whimperers are weaklings; praying men are not. They are the men to agitate a community for sobriety, and John Bright said: "Agitation means marshaling a people's conscience to do right and execute its laws."

And now let us look at the application of civil forces to moral questions from the other side, from the side of the civil administration. Until now, in this chapter, we may have been making the impression that law, as such, has but little to do in the control of the social compact, when our object has been to reach the sources of the efficiency of the civil law. With an understanding now of its nature and use, and with a lingering grasp on these sources, let us inquire into the province and power of society, as such, to control in matters relative to social evils.

It is within the province of the social compact to take recognition of the persistence of evil. Whatever evil may be in itself and in its sources, it is the enemy of man and society. Unless resisted, it will destroy both. Man, in his social life, has been the victim of evil in many forms. Evil shows itself capable of all the gradations and changes to which man's social life and tastes are subject. Evil is capable of civilization. It refines with human refinement. It takes on the appendages and benefits of art and culture. It becomes organized and encysted in the body politic. It has collective forces, it starts combinations, it controls influences, accumulates flood-tides, and frequently defies the world to locate its responsibility. It has the Satanic attribute of adjustment to all the new conditions of the race as they appear. It keeps in the mid-currents of the public tides, and, like certain species of reptiles which are said to have the power of changing color to blend with surroundings to escape detection, so many of the enemies of society have the power of varnishing their barbarities, and appearing in the livery of social conservators, and the spirit of general resistance to them is not attracted until they begin to sway society fundamentally. It is not an infrequent spectacle, therefore, to see a people struggling in the effort of self-preservation. Frequently the social body, in trying to save its own life, lays under tribute the researches of the maturest wisdom, and touches the motives which have moved

the springs of the world's history, and makes the issue successful by dealing with forces as well as with men.

One of the first elements of stubborn resistance to the efforts of a social body to reform its own life, is the conservatism of existing forms. That which has position and place always resents being disturbed, and at the least provocation enters into a defense of itself. The divine right of kings is but a recently exploded dogma. The blessed pope yet defends himself with the dictum of infallibility. Slavery once defended itself with specious pleas. It made appeals to the Word of God, and went to suicide, finally, in furious wrath. The English Dissenters were at first received with a mild affectation of patience; but when the fires they were kindling began to change the nation's religious life, and disturb the holders of fat livings, there was resentment.

An Augustinian monk caught the inmost spirit of the Word, and preached it against a corrupt Church. He was first called erratic; then he was made the creature of a merciful patience; but when he nailed his ninety-five theses to the Schloss Kirche at Wittenburg, there came on his head a storm. It was the revolt of established forms against the man who meant that they should be overthrown. Organized and thoroughly intrenched evils are not destroyed in a breath. Social destructives that have gotten under headway do not yield the day without a battle. They care

nothing for politics or history or the logic of events. They have no belief but in self. They persuade, they intimidate, they buy. Cases are about us where they furnish to a nation an annual anæsthetic of millions of dollars. Without conscience, and with such overwhelming agencies of power, it is but natural that they should go to their death only after protracted periods, and in desperation.

The life of every healthful growing society must pay the price of successfully overcoming the destructives that grow up in its own body. This is a perpetual work. It is never done. The price of liberty preserved is perpetual purifying. A single recreant age is the breeder of revolution for the next. The whole civilized world now is in a state of constant anxiety as to its safety from internal corrosives. The social evil; intemperance; the problem of rich and poor, which is more largely an ethical than an economic question,—all these are receiving constant attention. They fill the air with evil portent. De Pressensé, not long since, presented to the French Senate a petition against obscene literature, with the statement that "nothing prepares a nation for servitude like debauchery." This touches the truth of the matter. A nation has business with the moral life of its people. The theory of the State which excludes legislation with reference to the morals of its people is fatal.

It remains to be seen whether the Anglo-Saxon races can long endure prosperity. If they

are able to resist and overcome the evils that prey from within, they will be strengthened in coming through, and get a schooling to resist the strongest scourges the coming generations may send. For the race to hesitate in the presence of a lawless force is to begin to die. To be dominated by it is to find in it a curse for being untrue to the first social principle of self-preservation.

This brings us to the discussion of the right of society, through methods within its power, to protect itself from the moral destructives within its own body, especially such as those which arise out of personal crimes and vices. The backbone of a reform is always among the moral and voluntary forces; but civil society has something to do in the work of social reform, and with that which threatens its overthrow. The social defense is a first law of society. The means by which society defends itself from an enemy has all the elbow-room of a law of self-defense. Questions of this kind at first are neither statutory nor constitutional. They are such as are prompted by the instinct of self-preservation, and are always allowable. In the final resolve, all questions as to the power of society to take care of its life are swallowed up in the momentous one of social adroitness.

In the application of civil law to moral evils there has been discussion over the difference between vices and crimes. Dio Lewis makes vice personal and crime collective. To punish vice, it

is said, would be to punish every citizen, for none are free; hence we multiply laws against crime, and constantly tend to repeal laws against vice as such. It is true, the civil law is not able to enter into and administer on the smaller matters of conduct in the individual life of the citizen, yet it may take cognizance of such vices as damage society, because therein they become crimes. There is an act which is vice to the individual, and a crime to society. The fallacy here is in the presumption that a vice is never a crime. Crimes are made of vices. Not all the wrong-doings of a citizen can be reached by the statute. There must be room for the free play of personal faculties and powers to the limit of trespassing on society's rights. Wherever this right comes in, however—a question which must be decided in administration—all questions of personal liberty must take a secondary place, under the principle that the interests of right of the whole body are greater than the selfish interests of any single member of the body. There can be limitation put on "personal liberty" without the exercise of despotic power. The demand which society makes on the individual for its safety can not be regarded as an infringement of personal liberty. The definition of personal liberty by those who make of it a quality not to be touched by legislation, is an assumption. That is not so much liberty as the license of desire. There is no argument against a needful civil provision in the fact that it touches

the appetite, or that it is sumptuary, or that it has reference to personal evil habits. Facts of this kind are merely incidental. It is only in this as in all other cases, some of which involve no crime on the part of the citizen, but they deprive him of what would otherwise be his rights. A citizen is drafted for defensive war. His loss of liberty to attend to his private business is merely incidental, and not relevant in the greater issue. There are collective interests to which, in their very natures, all interests are subordinated. Personal liberty is always conditioned by the necessities of civilization. Civilization makes its demands on the individual for the welfare of the individual. It gives value received. No needful provision of the general law can be regarded as placing undue restriction on the individual. The members of a Christian commonwealth are fenced about and protected by many unseen and impalpable social forces which grow out of wise civil provisions in the way of the applied statutes. There is no freedom without its due bounds. The supremacy of the individual will over the wise law that is to govern the mass would lead to anarchy. One of the first things a citizen must learn in the interests of social order, is that personal liberty is not independent of the mass. As society takes upon itself newer and lighter forms, individual losses are suffered for which there is no compensation. By the invention of a machine workmen in certain lines are thrown out of work

and a trade. Railroads once made useless millions of money invested in canals. In every improvement and advance there are certain losses and inconveniences. The freedom of the employment of capital is interfered with when cities take control of the construction of tenement-houses. If prohibition, as a law against the rum-traffic, prevails, thousands of men will be thrown out of employment in the breweries and distilleries and bottling establishments, and in the hop-fields; but, indeed, shall there be no progress because of this? Shall such incidental casualties be an effective clog against higher conditions? With those who violate the plainest laws of man's collective prosperity, it is worse than folly to discuss deliberately the abstract question of the right of society to enact and execute repressive laws. They are not the subjects of argument. Their attitude is odious, and they should be made to feel the stern hand of a nation's repression. Lord Chesterfield, more than a hundred years ago, said in the House of Lords: "Vice, my lords, is not properly to be taxed, but suppressed."

Whenever any vice among a people rises to such magnitude as to be defined by the law, it is very properly a subject of repressive legislation. The punitive civil code has its highest uses as it is exercised toward the civil suppression of all the definable evils which afflict society; and by the civil law, as discussed elsewhere under its limitations, we mean the formulated consensus of soci-

ety's opinion as to what ought to be in legislative regulations. Efficient law is the judgment of society in civil matters.

With reference to the universally recognized vices, such as thieving, adultery, incest, murder, and drunkenness, their prohibition is no longer a question of policy. The Government ought to exert its full power to repress them. The methods by which the most efficient repressive forces can be brought to bear on these things are political questions, and to be settled in the forum of political discussion and the ballot largely; but the things themselves are not partisan, but moral.

This is such a clearly recognized principle of statesmanship that many of the Church bodies have formally given expression to it as a duty of civil government. They declare for total abstinence for the individual, and the complete prohibition of the traffic, as the duty of civil government.

The meaning here is constitutional prohibition, rather than statutory, which is legislative enactment, while the other may or may not be. There is a difference between a statute and a principle, even though the principle be in the statute, for a principle is broader than any statute. Statutory prohibition relates to legislative enactments for the suppression of the traffic. It is partisan, usually, and may have many forms, and is not environed by the same conditions in any two States of the Union. Constitutional prohibition, like all

other purely constitutional measures, is never partisan; and in this sense it is used by the Church. It takes its place among the basal laws of good government.

Constitutional law is the clinching of the social fabric to the base of all government, which is moral law.

XI.

THE ORGANIZATION OF RELIGION AND THE SPIRIT OF AMERICAN LAW.

RELIGION, as an individual concern, implies the gift of gracious blessings from God, the harmony of the personal life with him, and the outpouring of the soul's affection to him and to the objects of its desire in saving men. The religious principle is incoming that it may be outgoing. "Freely ye have received, freely give." The spirit of the gospel is the desire to bless others, an ambitious desire to send out the largest possible sweep of influence. This lies in the direction of organization. The organization of the Church has in it, therefore, the idea of expediency. It needs no other authority or reason. The ecclesiastical idea must be maintained simply for its working efficiency. Church authority as such, succession, the validity of the sacraments and orders, are not likely to have controlling influence over the mind of the century from now forward. *Ex-cathedra* methods are all out of date. That which is right and proper and practical constitutes and controls the Church plans and methods of the age. Tradition is dead, privileged orders are denied, formalities are denounced, Church sanctions are without attraction, and the whole

spirit of the religious life is coming out on the broad New Testament basis of doing things "decently and in order," which is the world's Magna Charta of organized religious activities. Organization has nothing in itself as an end. Its purpose is to economize and conserve the work. It involves the element of co-operation. That which can not be done singly can be done in combination. The Brooklyn bridge involves more than the thought of the engineer. It means corporate capital, and united and organized action on the part of workmen of every talent. Without the collective agencies that structure would never have been. Man, working in his individual capacity, can accomplish some things; but the larger things for the race are done through organization, or by the direction of personal agencies. The organization of the religious life has this reason in itself. The religious life-work of the individual is conserved and perpetuated by putting it in the regularly organized channels which surround him. What is done has thereby a guarantee of preservation. The Church is an instrumentality whereby the world gets the largest use of the individual.

It therefore has its outer forms, its creeds, its plans, its methods, its church-buildings, its practical economies, to the end that the largest things may come of its efforts. So plainly wise are these outward provisions that the law of the land, which is itself a provision of like kind on the secular side, gives recognition of these rules and regula-

tions of the religious life. It says of them, they shall be the rules which shall govern these bodies when deliberately declared. Justice Miller, of the Supreme Court, has given a ruling which expresses the spirit of the law toward the codes of government formulated by the Christian Churches.

He says:

"The right to organize voluntary religious associations, to assist in the expression and dissemination of any religious doctrine, and to create tribunals for the decision of any controverted question of faith within the association, and for the ecclesiastical government of all the individual members, congregations and officers within the association is unquestioned. All who unite themselves to such a body do so with an implied consent to this government, and are bound to submit to it. It is of the essence of religious unions, and of their right to establish tribunals for the decision of questions arising among themselves, that these decisions should be binding in all cases of ecclesiastical cognizance, subject only to such appeals as the organization itself provides for."

This decision, without question, expresses the spirit of the law in all cases of discipline or Church law or doctrine. It declares that Church law within its jurisdiction shall be the law of the land. It is given efficiency within its sphere. The Church does not expect intrusion from the civil law in the administration of Church affairs. The Church must also do its work without intrud-

ing. Under the genius of the American law, the Church that assumes to itself to intermeddle with civil justice is an usurper. If the civil power, being in the ascendant now, in that it has to do with the whole mass rather than a part, does not relegate to itself control in immediate religious concerns, it will not likely be in a temper to accept ecclesiastical jurisdiction over its own field. That Church which claims that the State ought to be administered on religious rather than civil principles, and that it ought to define and apply them, is more than likely to feel the resentment of the civil power. That Church which resists the growth of liberty and freedom of conscience, which grasps at wealth and power, and intrigues for secular influence, will, in this free air, sooner or later find itself in the harness of limitations. At present any clash between the two systems means the submission of the religious forces to whatever the civil may dictate, because of its supremacy among the masses. If we keep off the perilous ground of history, there is no need of a clash or of the supremacy of either one over the other.

Protestantism in this country must succeed without entering into even the borders of the untenable ground which has been held by Romanists for centuries; and it must put itself in unconditional resistance to any religious body that undertakes to give direction to the political policies of the country.

It may seem to the reader that in Protestant lines the danger of entering the political field is small. The direct danger is small, unless from Romanism provoking it in self-defense; but the greater danger is toward the influence and drift of a political complexion. A Church imbued with a semi-political spirit in an extreme time, and for the end to be accomplished, and that end a good one, may throw nearly its entire strength in the direction of its known political sympathies, and, as the fact becomes known, that Church, whether it wishes it or not, will be counted in the estimate of policy for all future campaigns.

Ecclesiastical bodies, by corporate action influencing legislation, are always unhealthful. If it should ever come to pass that synods and conferences should have large influence in the practical politics of the country, religion will be degraded and history will have its saddest repetition.

There can be no motive for the invasion of either of these domains by the other. The exigencies of the times will never justify such a thing. Suppose any religious organization by entering the lists for political control, could gain its end, and the end laudable, the means used would result in greater evil than anything gained. Momentary success could be gained by such methods as would be fatal to the perpetuity of the Church. It could take its own life in the act of what was supposed to be success.

The thirst for power on the part of those who may exercise it is not yet quenched. Modern history has many illustrations of expedients for putting checks on the ambition of those who come to power. It is well known that civil rulers have less power when disrelated from the immediate control of religious concerns. In other words, for the State to give direction to ecclesiastical economics would give it greater power. It were possible for the civil jurisdiction to exercise this power now if it were purposed toward it. It will be wisdom among the religious forces if they offer the State no occasion for this. If the Churches expect the secular life to remain on its own territory of operation, prudence suggests that, in its councils, it do not give too much advice or suggest too many political methods, but remain within its own heritage of the moral and spiritual forces.

The Churches of America are now suffering from the clash of political antagonisms within their own ranks, through the haste of those who say that their religious and political convictions are never to be separated, but to be uttered indiscriminately on all occasions. If this sentiment should prevail, and this state of things become general, the denominational Church life of this country would soon sort itself according to political affiliations, and there would begin from all quarters a species of meddling to provoke the resentment of the civil power, which *de facto* has

the day. As in Mexico and Italy and France, we are in the presence of an accreting liberalism, which will use all the occasions of offense, on the part of the Church, to throw the civil power in antagonism. There is now only one conclusion forcing itself on all good citizens. It is this: If the Church intrude on civil authority and lose its friendship, it has committed an irreparable blunder. It were possible for the American Churches, in a senseless way, to go to ruin on the breakers of an unorganized secular spirit.

Another possible calamity also awaits the Church. If the Christian life fades; if gospel work is done by weaklings; if the Christian forces are only so in name, and by failing to accomplish the work in this generation which gives them a right to live in the next; or if the secular spirit in the popular mind comes to be more efficient in the overthrow of social evils than the religious, it will, of course, come to that supremacy in which it will absorb everything.

Religious organizations, therefore, in this country, will never be able to turn from their own legitimate work without a general decay in the faith. The simplicity and purity of the Christian life has always been imperfectly realized after the Church has entered upon a world career. The finest field for the vital religious activities that the world has ever known is before Churches now. They are under the best civil administration for their fullest development; and before them,

through their activities, lies the unmeasured glory of a Nation already without a peer. Will they keep to their work of saving souls, one by one? Out of the childhood and youth of the land will they build a character to make secure the institutions which shall express the greatest things man has learned of liberty and progress?

XII.

POLITICAL PARTIES AND THE POLITICIANS—THE CHURCH AND THE PREACHERS.

THE political party idea is very familiar to the American mind. Bodies of men united in voluntary organization, to promote the principles upon which they are agreed, is a necessary expression of the mode by which a free people decide questions of policy, law, and government. Political parties have their reason in popular government. In monarchies, where the popular will is not consulted, there can be no reason for them. Where the people rule, parties are inevitable. There must be expression of opinion; there must be room for debate and for the sway of reason, where the masses have the ballot as a means of settling political destinies. The political party, therefore, without being recognized by the fundamental document of the Nation, and without having any provision made for it, arises naturally out of the provision which the document makes for the control of the people. Party organization is the application of common sense to the social exigencies which the Constitution brings about. It may not be an ideal way, but it is the best practical way we know of getting the voice of the

majority on all questions which must, of right, come before the whole people. We do not know how to administer our form of government in any other way.

To the American mind, parties are what the name implies—political. They are not religious; they are not moral. Paradoxical as the utterance may appear, they ought not to be religious or moral. If they were either, they would not be what they are. Legitimately, they have only to do with political questions—such questions as have to do with the interests of the State. Parties may deal with questions vitally related to religion and morals, but only from the side which affects the public civil welfare.

The common sentiment expects a party to have principles. Questions of foreign policy, questions of revenue and finance, questions of economy of administration and internal policy, questions of popular education and the franchise,—these currents in the popular mind crystallize into forms and constitute our party organizations. These are, practically, the producing forces of party life. The party does not constitute these issues; the issues constitute the party. Even when a party takes up an issue, and gives it significance and form in the popular mind, the thing taken up is father to the force that promulgates. Party organization is, therefore, the servant of the mind of man in controlling his civil affairs. A party ought not to be regarded

in any higher sense than this. It is folly to expect a party to do so and so above what it is.

The producing causes of all better conditions in law and society lie back of their outward expression. Not what appears; not what is professed; not what the demagogue declares, but what really is the consensus of party spirit and principle, will be done. We frequently have expressions of what this party or that party will do for the people if it shall come into power. In the intensity of zeal to carry the majorities, there is always expression and pledging above what is ever realized. There is always the declaration of great moral principles, and with this the intimation that the opposition is lacking in these qualities. There is a play on the moral life for catch-penny purposes. The opposition composed of bad fellows, is the cry of the demagogue, and it is echoed by the deluded.

It is not the business of a political party formally to adopt the Decalogue, or pass judgment on it. Is it in the sphere of a party to announce a distinct moral proposition? Allowably; but it is not political in that act. A political party, as to its issues, signifies antagonism. It implies a declaration of principles of such kind as is usually distinct from those of its opponents. If this were not so, parties would merge into each other, and the death of formal issues would be the result. An accepted ethical plank in a platform is simply giving utterance to that which common

fairness of citizenship will grant to the other party. For any party to take up the cry, "We are of the Lord; you are of Satan!" is a species of moral monopolizing that has nearly always resulted in defeat, as it should. It is political Phariseeism. As a matter of fact, ethical principles may be found at the bottom of all sound political principles. The first law of life for human action and human thought has a moral side; but the common understanding of a people distinguishes between that which makes up the issue of a party life and that which does not, in that the aim of a platform is not ethical but political. The common language of a political platform will have for its undertone and base the moral principles which underlie the public weal; and for the purposes of such a document nothing more is needful, because useless. If by common consent, and without formal declaration, the common moralities can not be granted the adherents of a party, there exists a desperation which no declaration will ever cure. Morality is a sovereign, and it sits over and above the strife, and must not be dragged down into it, to be passed on, or vetoed, or abolished by popular voice. That would be revolution; it would be death. Only shallow thinkers are deluded with the idea of the goodness of a political party. They are of those who have very clear and settled convictions on a non-determinable question. Parties are not organized on ethical but on political estimates. Ethical values are individual in

party organization. Because of the lamentable failure to make this distinction, it is so that very much secret political motive goes out into the canvass under cover of zeal for morals and religion. However great the shame that moral asseverations should be used in this way, the fact remains that they are made the expedients of partisan ends. Politics may be so cunningly worked into the cause of religion that the appearance is of veritable religion itself. The selfish designs of public men are frequently colored by some pretext for the safety of morals and religion.

Selfish ambition frequently disguises its purpose by assuming the garb of reformative fervor. It is hard to detect the slick art of the demagogue. A candidate for Congress in a Methodist neighborhood extolled the "mourners' bench." The speech was effective, as shown in the tiling of the votes. Not all that glitters is gold. There is a form of piety that is sincere, but without experience with men and things, that goes to the politician to ask for such conditions as will enable it conscientiously to voice itself in the ballot and civil affairs. Alas for the pitiable scene! The situation signifies that such piety needs more knowledge and the courage that comes from it. It is asking that an effect transform itself into a cause. It is asking that there be accomplished *ab extra* that which can be done only through the slow and honest processes of spiritual reformation. This age is given to expect too much of the poli-

tician. The function of the ordinary politician, as he is, is not to press to practice or discover great moral principles. He can not be depended on as a motive power or moral governor. He is a sort of belting, or tumbling-rod, connecting the sum total of society's forces with the machinery of government. He gets things done on the basis of his being an exponent of social debits and credits. The politician is the man who is constantly feeling for the popular pulse. He is not so much interested as to how it is as to where it is. If you wish anything granted from the politician, go put your finger on the pulse of society, and ask in harmony with its expression—ask anything, good or bad.

We are not quibbling here over the derivation of a word; we are defining a character. The politician never determines anything with reference to law or method. He is the middle man. He can be depended on to execute the popular will as soon as he finds out what it is. And while some of us accuse him of being a dullard in these things, it may be that his experience is a better thermometer of the popular will than our ethical enthusiasms. The politician will not be found resisting what the people have determined on. He is like a water-wheel. He turns round and moves the machinery when the water is turned on. The water does not come from the wheel, but from the springs in the mountains. Then why cudgel him because of his low-grade esti-

mates? He is dealing with things as they are. He is a practical man, though he may be a destructionist. He devises a shift for the moment, and he may have to mend it the next moment. He is, nevertheless, practical; he does something. He is not expected to look forward or backward. He is a deviser of present expedients. His star is the policy of the moment. If the face of society needs a beautiful complexion now, he is as likely as any to administer arsenic, and let the secondary consequences take care of themselves. Those who are in the routine of managing the political machine dislike anything new, or any principle that will take years of tedious toil to put into organic ascendency, and only because they disarrange things and cause thought and trouble. To the practical man in politics it appears very unwise to figure on secondary results, or to have too broad a knowledge of final consequences and plans. Politicians and law-makers are controlled by indirection. Mold opinion, deepen conviction, sway the majority; this will do it. The man who is in the minority, unless he holds a balance of power, will waste his time with the politician. Let one thing be settled,—the politician is not a philanthropist. No blame attached; philanthropy is not his business.

Forecasting, to keep out of danger not yet on hand, is likely to be the work of those not in politics. To bring about better conditions in society is the work of the Christian and those who think as he

does. If a great reform is carried to success and victory through some political issue, the glory belongs to those who fought the battle from the beginning, rather than to those who made a dash at the closing hours. Parties and politicians are not, from first sources, reformative forces. Party principles and their exponents are of the lighter things; they will float and rise as the stream of good influences rises. Then how futile to expect through them to reform and save the world!

There is a first and second work in the evolution of social forms, and these kinds of work can not change places; neither can one be eliminated and be absorbed into the other. That nothing in a social way can be accomplished except through moral suasion, is the expression of a half truth. That by legal methods alone the good work can be wrought, is the expression of another half truth; so the power of the civil life can not be dispensed with. It becomes the more efficient and needful as the power of the moral life among a people is significant and healthful. The two systems are strengthened by advancing hand in hand. Reforms, therefore, for the safety of society, enter as an element in citizenship because the conditions of a just State demand them. The civil institutions of a country must have adequate statutory provision for the common protection and encouragement of the well-disposed classes. They must have punitive and, it may be, reformative measures for the vicious and depraved. For these

purposes in the State we have the instrumentality of law. We legislate, however, as citizens, not as Church members or Christians. It is in the spirit of our institutions that the law justly recognizes no superior quality in a citizen because of his religious faith. Toward the suppression of evils as citizens, we test the force of expedients which may best voice the popular will. We differ. We put our methods into the campaign for the suffrage of the people. It is a common right to enter this open field of the majorities. Into this field the religious element may not formally enter. No extra credit shall be given a man because of his piety. Religious convictions may constitute the highest citizen, and the citizen may enter. But why may not the Christian, as such, enter this field? Because it is opposed to the spirit of our institutions, which have been so delicately poised on the question of religion. Our institutions require only of the citizen political justification in the exercise of the right of citizenship. To cast a ballot, among us, is not directly a moral or religious act; it is a political act. Neither morals nor religion is a candidate for the popular favor by a formal majority. In their nature they could not be. Some things the majorities settle, but plain questions of right and wrong can never enter the lists to be accepted or rejected by a show of hands. The ballot can do great things, but it is not the panacea for all ills. It is simply the mouth-piece of public opinion. A vote expresses ostensibly a

question of policy, not morals. It always has its ethical value and responsibility, affecting to a degree the public welfare; but it is an individual matter with the voter, and is not subject to party espionage. The spirit of the Constitution is that the majority is politically right. Possibly the majority may be morally wrong, but the presumption is on the other side; so much so that the minority always stultifies itself in asserting the moral turpitude of the majority. According to the genius of modern governments, the majority has a right to control. There is no other way in a state of freedom. To rail out against the supposed wickedness of the great majority in its formulation of the political code, is a species of foolishness. For one citizen to offer moral rebuke to another for his vote on questions of policy, is to assume that which is non-determinable. In this turmoil of the political pot, the man who knows for a certainty that his vote is expressing the moral purities, and that his opponent is a great sinner, is a very king of nonsense. There is no influence of much greater damage to a good cause than what appears to be a growing and thoughtless spirit among us, which has become proud and haughty, and contemptuous of the great and patient work to be done for social elevation, but is constantly proposing some easy method of purifying society, constantly proclaiming the weakness of "merely moral forces," and loudly descanting on the sovereign efficacy of the civil law, if it were put in shape, and throwing

the responsibility of a defective legislation on the great unwashed majority, then going its way and giving itself credit for the highest saint.

The social body only moves as the mass moves. There must be a general inspiration, a general uplift, if there be any general progress. The full and healthful advance of a few individuals to the highest ideals of social living, may be regarded as simply phenomenal, and not difficult to be achieved. To move and lift a few is to accomplish something, but it is not to reform society. Ancient institutions had a few bright names. Now and then an intellectual brilliant glared above the darkness, and yet holds a place among notable characters; but below them was the mass, lost in a black empire of ignorance and social anarchy. A true reform moves as fast as it moves the mass of the people. Its movements are not to be measured by the sprightly soul who has seen things, and has gone on so far ahead of the crowd that he can not help along with it. The true reformer stands for the crowd. He helps along the crowd at the sacrifice of highest conditions for himself. He does not run ahead and belabor it for its slowness and wickedness. He accepts the situation that in this country the crowd settles the destinies. All solid marching is done by the body of the army. Colonels and generals may dash ahead and return; they may play up and down the lines; but an army only moves when the mass moves. So solid progress is in the hands of the masses. Admin-

istrative methods can not take upon themselves absolute ideals without producing rigidity and revolt. It must be remembered that the law-maker may not shoot out of sight of his age and country. It is not practicable yet to turn the government of the world into the hands of those having the highest ideals simply because they are not in the majority. The voice and will of the majority constitutes no ground of complaint on the part of a minority with high ideals. That the majority shall rule for the present is the best we know. Statesmen have never given us a workable theory by which moral excellence shall have a superior voice in the ordinary civil administration. The writer has gone to the polls and cast a sober, deliberate ballot, and has been followed by a drunken citizen, casting a ballot that exactly balanced his voice in his country's affairs. Ought this to be? Who knows a better way?

As political sentiments and convictions are not to invade the religious sphere, so the religious life, in its own name, can not be projected into the political field. It does not belong to the life of the Church to take up any question of political expediency, and wrap around it the wings of the cherubim, and make of it a sort of eternal verity. It may not be an eternal verity. It may not be what is really wanted. It may be over-heavy on one side and over-light on the other. In the swift change of legal applications, so necessary in these times, it may need strengthening or elimination.

It may not be the ultimate law, and, therefore, be the occasion of needless antagonism. All the legal phases of reformative activity can be safely relegated to the citizen, and trusted to the forces and counter forces of the field in which the best law survives in the degree that intelligence and virtue are the controlling undercurrents in the popular mind.

The Church can not healthfully espouse any political method—first, because political methods are not first in importance, being rather resultant than causative. They arise out of the kingdom of the moral forces, like miasms out of a swamp, or like flowers on the hill-top. And the Church can not complain of the limitation, because there is wide room for all its efficiencies back in the region where the destinies are settled in a satisfactory way, though they frequently call for patience. Second, the Church of Christ needs equal evangelical influence over men of all political creeds. This it can not have even if semi-officially it takes up any partisan measure to carry it to its issues. No doubt it were possible for the religious life of this country, for the sake of a good cause, to take up a question of political expediency—such as might have relationship to any of our great reforms, for instance—and urge it to a successful issue; but the procedure would be extremely hazardous, because, if successful, there would be a coming down from the high grounds of revealed truth, and a com-

mittal of the Church to the uncertainties of the campaign. It would be a flushing of the energies of the religious life with hopes of a speedy and short way forbidden in the gospel; and when there is once a committal to this sort of work it must continue, as there would be no chance of retreat from it; and when defeat comes, as it probably would, as change in the policy and form of law in this country is frequent, there would then be brought against the policy of the Church the revulsive force of an organized majority, against which the Church is not likely to prosper. It is the mission of the Church, by the gospel, to save all classes in all parties; and if from its borders there should come the advocacy of any partisan measure, those who are not in harmony with that measure would be estranged, and rightly so, for such a measure is not the property of the Church.

It should not become so that when a party comes to power it could possibly have any grudge at any of the organic religious forms because of the part that organism took against it, or even for its unformulated but strong sentiments in matters of civil policy. It is unwise for a Church to take any political attitude that would produce among organized classes any irritation against it. There is but one step from hatred of a Church to hatred of religion. The Church can not afford to take any position that will fan the disaffection between the secular and sacred spirit.

Everything which concerns the life of society is of importance to the Church; but some things, because of partisanship and its strifes, and because of the things themselves, lie outside the scope of treatment by the Church.

Suppose a national party convention assembled. Candidates are nominated, and a platform of principles is declared. There is certainly no unfitness in such a proceeding. But before adjournment, suppose that convention sends out a committee to bring in a report on "Predestination," or the "Mode of Baptism," or "Gospel Work among the Fijis." The Nation would laugh at the blunder, and the blunder would be a defeat.

This unwritten law of fitness applies with equal force to synods and associations and conferences. Whenever they voice themselves on the political expediencies, they go beyond their sphere, and blunder. Further, we believe, with Dr. Buckley, that ecclesiastical bodies, as such, are not competent to take such action. Such action may be interpreted as the voice of a majority of individuals to which the minority are not bound; and the blunder may be put in the fact that such company of individuals did not adjourn as an ecclesiastical body before such action was taken. All these proceedings, however, have a calamity. They go out in the name of the Church, and they take their place as part of the problem of the

political calculator. All resolutions involving political matters are out of place in a deliberative Church assembly.

We take no tilt at a straw man here. The infection is abroad. These are times of more or less ecclesiastical tinkering with politics. Many of our people are not drawing the line. There are preachers and Churches unconsciously in the double business of politics and religion. This is the open and century-long policy of Rome, and because of her efforts to perpetuate her power along political lines she is a menace to the Nation. A non-sectarian State can not exist in harmony with a partisan Church. If a Church is committed formally to a partisan issue, rather than to the broad patriotism that knows no party, it is committed to a policy that will work the destruction of liberty as we understand it; but, first and most fatally, it works the destruction of vital religion among a people. A Church thereby destroys the power by which it wields the supreme truths of religion.

The Missionary Baptist Church in the Middle Western States has been having prosperity in accretions, it is said, largely from one political party in the country regions. In the numbers added there is a definite political complexion. This does not arise out of a Church policy or purpose, but it represents a probable fact. The Methodist Episcopal Church has a political complexion. This is not ostensibly so, it is not formally or

declaratively or intentionally so; but it is nevertheless so. By the law of accretion corresponding to the temper of the Church it is so; and the fact has in it a needless hindrance in its own work, if not a danger. This great Church, without any purpose, and without its consent, is being made a factor in political calculations now, and, without extreme carefulness, it may yet come upon conditions where it will be used in the face of its own resistance. An important outward blessing to the Methodist Church would be the breaking of its political complexion so that there could be no sort of estimate put upon it. Many conferences now, thoughtlessly, pass resolutions expressive of some political method. It is called "speaking out" on "great issues," and it is all done in the name of the Lord. It goes out as a political *ex cathedra*. It has the smell of infallibility about it, very distasteful to freemen. The writer belongs to the Methodist Episcopal Church, and he loves it as he loves his life; and yet he could wish, if by no other means than by a lash of scorpions, she might be turned from meddling, through her deliberative assemblies, with that which does not belong to her to take cognizance of. It may be considered that the Church, as such, does not give expression in political methods, and, in the nature of things, it can not, and that any action of a body of ministers is only the expression of the prevailing sentiment of that many men. This may be satisfactory as an interpre-

tation to the minority of that body, and through it they may declare immunity from the action, yet in practical politics the Church must largely take the responsibility of the action, and bear all the consequences. All such actions have the effect purposed by the majority, that of having the Church indorse certain political issues for the good effect it will have. These actions do not coerce nor compel votes. They are intended to influence, and that is as much as can be said of any other political agency. Because of this fact they are all the more offensive and out of place. The incompetency of the body to take such action never seriously blunts the edge of the influence of the action, and it usually swallows up the *contra* influence of the minority, who may believe in some other political method. The question of the soundness of the political method espoused is neither here nor there. In the well-known relations of the secular and religious systems in this country it becomes a question of propriety. It is presumption in a Church body to voice itself on political questions, for the reason that this is not its field, and because it weakens its moral and religious influence over those who honestly differ from the methods indorsed. In all such resolutions passed by bodies of religious workers, whether it be intended or not, there is in it to those who are not religious an assumption of superior moral insight which is entirely out of good taste in an atmosphere where every man, politically, is

the peer of every other man. Whatever be the character of Christian work, it will never do to leave out of view the fact that we are living in a non-ecclesiastical type of society. A preacher's voice and influence now is simply that of a man among his fellow-men, and because of this very thing the age gives promise of being very healthful for the influence of the preacher. A non-ecclesiastical social life does not signify unbelief or a non-ethical life. The moral system of the Word has gone out with the spirit of Christ in it, to touch more lives and leaven more agencies than ever since the shifting of the focal of social activities.

It has taken a long time to overcome the old ideas. To come out of the fetich that a peculiar sanctity elevated the ministry above the common people into the modern gospel that one clean thing is as sacred as another, is a remarkable change, to which the preacher himself must find an adjustment. There are no secrets now known to the preacher which are not shared in by all the citizens of the divine republic. Manhood has superseded the priestly function, and the work of a worthy and capable preacher is being recognized. In the degree that he becomes a man among men, according to the measure of his spirituality and enterprise, his enthusiasm and heroic spirit as a propagandist, will the people identify themselves with him in gospel work.

There is more hope of the American ministry

than of any other in the world. The preacher can remain the exponent of the spiritual forces that are to guarantee the Nation's perpetuity. He holds a place also from which he can do more damage to the cause of the gospel than ever before. He can become a recreant. He can be a lover of ease and of fat things. He can preach his politics, vote his religion, and by that means alone send his Nation into atheism.

XIII.

WHAT RELIGION DOES FOR THE SOCIAL ORDER.

THESE pages have been written under the belief that religion—that is, the qualities which inhere in the Christian religion—are among the greatest agencies for maintaining good government. They constitute, we believe, the strongest social bonds, and remain chiefest among the forces that control men. And for this reason we have aimed constantly to impress the reader's mind with the thought that legal forms, with all the importance that may be attached to them—and they ought not to be underestimated, for they have great significance—are secondary. They are resultant rather than causative.

At the bottom of things socially, constituting one of the bed-rocks of this civil building, are the moral and spiritual forces. Whenever a people start down-grade morally, they start to social and national death. A materialistic age is an age of disintegration. In the degree that man has given attention to ethical concerns and to spiritual values has he grown strong in himself and gained the mastery of the conditions about him. Christianity, in these times, being the expression of man's interest in himself on his higher side, and also of

God's thought for him, is an important element, therefore, in the nation's life. Religion, as a term not so broad as Christianity, may stand for the vital interest which the human spirit has and takes in spiritual things. It reaches and changes the individual first, and through him it transforms and lifts the collective life. Religion deals, therefore, not with man directly as a member of the commonwealth, but as a being responsible to God for conduct and life, and with this conduct and life involving the whole of human relationship, he goes to the commonwealth equipped with the highest kind of citizenship.

There is a power which a woman wields as a mother rather than a voter. So there is a life possible for any community which may give direction to the social forces through just that sort of power. (Without passing judgment here on the high claims of woman to the ballot—whatever good might come to society by that thing—if it be the thought of any that it would take anything from the responsibilities of the domestic side, great will be the delusion. If the vote should make the woman any the less a mother, the ballot would be a curse. That which makes the world what it is, is not outside conditions, but inside states.) Instead, therefore, of aiming at high things for society by extraneous means, let the religious life have its fullest expression in society; give it its normal influence as an instrumentality in human government. It can be made

significant. Communities over the land are bearing fruits of it as a fact. It can put such significance and force into the fundamental ideals of government, that social forms will, through its spirit voiced in them, take on themselves more and more satisfactory forms. This normal and voluntary expression of the religious life must stand for that righteousness which is necessary for the welfare of the social order. It must be the felt force of that supernatural sanction which produces right conduct, and through this strengthen all the appliances of the practical civil code. There must be such an influence on the voluntary motives as will carry with it the conviction that spiritual interests exceed in importance temporal interests—such as will make the religious idea prevail. There must be such an influence as will keep the sensible religious organizations of the land from being attacked or pushed aside for such methods of work as make promises of speedier ends. It must be such an influence as will protect the Church from defeat as a collective social power.

It is not for the State to recognize the divine sanction of the religious forces. The religious life itself must be of such quality as to put its own sanction on all the social forces. That which preserves the social order will not be retained unless the Christian religion becomes their conservator. The individual quickened by the power of Christ, associated with other individuals having

the same life, will call invariably out of that association such constitutional forms as will curb and control the vicious element, put the opportunities and motives of crime at as great distance as human law may be able, and preserve society from the weakness that ends in decay. Religion, by its very essence and world-work, presides at the source of life, where the fountains of character are opened. It touches the heart, it arouses the conscience, and gives the spirit a conception of its immortal dignity. Religion makes the foundations of this whole outward life steady and strong.

It will occur to the reader, with a little reflection, that while the direct end of revealed truth is not society, it would be impossible for that truth to accomplish its purpose without having a controlling influence in the general affairs of this life. While there is a sense in which gospel agencies appear to be limited; while it is a kingdom which comes without observation; while through silent forces it is to build a spiritual empire; while the pageantry of courts, the retinues of princes, marshaled armies, crowned heads are rejected and renounced as of no value in this kingdom of souls; while it can not deal with outward law and government as such, it has to do with the first principles of human control.

One of the legitimate and sure ends of a pure gospel is to strengthen the social impulse, and give it direction by preparing the way for its nor-

mal and free working. The forces which disintegrate and destroy in human society need to be attacked in their stronghold. The virtues which buttress the highest institutions of men must be re-enforced from above. When a pure and simple Christian life is operative, as a rule there are orderly homes, trained children, industry, economy, thrift, respect for the rights of others, charity—out of which is born a neighborly spirit.

THE GOSPEL DEALS WITH THE INDIVIDUAL.

The gospel begins at the right end by beginning with the individual, and the scope of its wide destinies is not limited ultimately when it ends there. The gospel is the great defender and advocate of individualism. The first interest of the gospel, therefore, is not to lift men in the mass. The end of the gospel is the man—the individual character. The individual is the unit in society—is the unit in all moral government. The personal man, therefore, is the measurement of law and order and progress. He is the only indivisible, distinguishable, separable force. As are the personalities in their totality, so is the community, the State, the world. The gospel awakens in the soul a conception of its value; makes it know that it is worth while to strive, to be, to become; to expect a future greater than the past; to contend for its place and the largest sweep of its influence. The gospel in the human soul causes it to insist that it shall not be ab-

sorbed in the mass, like bricks in a building. The gospel offers the personal soul the possibility of escape from any sort of destruction. It has, therefore, the power of survival, and the ability to command the services of all social forces. The end of human society, therefore, is the individual, because the less must serve the greater. Society, institutions, even civilizations, are no more than instrumentalities. The man is greater than all these. If by the spirit and application of the civil code the personal soul is deflected from the course of its perfection; if there be arrested development of the personal life; if self-activity is smothered out; if the personal intellect and will is absorbed so that it exists more as a social whole than a unit, the ends of both society and religion are defeated. It is the glory of the gospel that in its applications to human history, political government is gradually harmonizing with the gospel spirit of individuation. Man's present personality is the developed force of twenty centuries of Christian thought, and it fully requires for its expression just such forms of popular and free government as now appear. From now on there must be room for the individual to make the most of himself,—there must be a chance for culture and character. The largest social movements in modern life are, in one form and another, expressions of this one truth. This strife and bitterness of partisanship; this restless, determined spirit of the oppressed masses toward better physical

conditions and toward the assertion of personal rights, with equal opportunities and aspirations,—all this is the voice of the individual man, a gospel growth.

It may be seen that if the first end of the gospel were to enthrone the highest, most efficient, and complete civil forms, such a thing could not be done by beginning on the forms themselves, but by securing such states of the personal life as would constantly enlarge it and fill it with great affections and impulses. For all the restrictions and limitations of the gospel, it gives the personal life large compensation. It frowns on the adverse forces of the civil life, and it puts into the social compact the strongest elements of rest and contentment. That which puts moral and spiritual energy into the lives of workmen, and enlarges the philanthropy of those who have accumulated and become masters of great commercial forces, is the chief element in solving the problem of rich and poor.

Socialism fails to cure social evils.

There are territories where socialism threatens the foundations of the social structure. It has nothing definite in religious faith. Its prevailing drift is skeptical or materialistic, frequently atheistic; but its primary blunder is in the conception that the State is the originator of all forms of justice, and, therefore, what needs to be done can be done by the State. All origination

of rights, all authority, all power, is given the State. This fundamental blunder has led to the historic confusion of socialism; to its failure in application, because with this base of political doctrine it has never been able to see the proper limit and sphere of civil authority. Socialism, with its helps and sympathies, has infused into the public mind the idea that whatever needs to be done for any class or condition, can be done by the State, and as a result the world is not beyond the age of temporizing expedients for human ills in government. Political plasters are being applied to all parts of the body politic, with the expectation that they will cure. Drugs never cure diseases, they help nature at times; all real cures are constitutional.

The failure of socialism may help us more clearly to see that a community, without a religious life to give temper and strength to morals and obedience to just laws, is diseased. In proportion, therefore, as the institutions of religion loose their hold on the multitudes, the fabric of society is in peril. The greatest enemy of corrupt civil practices, of neglected legislation, and of social anarchy, is the Son of the carpenter of Nazareth; and the greatest hope for the overthrow of these common foes of men is the work of those who follow him, and take his doctrine and teachings to the poorest of the poor. The Golden Rule is the only stay of society in the midst of these antagonisms.

COMPETITION AND CROWDED POPULATION.

In sparsely settled countries the spirit of socialism appears to be stronger than where population has become so great that the individual has been brought into a struggle with the crowd. It is a matter of fact that in crowded populations one's country is not such a sacred thing. Patriotic feelings do not stir people so strongly when the struggle for existence is intense; and under such conditions an appeal for the safety of the nation is seldom sufficiently strong to check any social evil. For men and women who are under the press of extreme exertion to make headway in the world, it is next to impossible to convince them that their nationality is of any great value to them. The gathering of millions into small territories has brought intense and heated conditions; it has put everything under the whip, a condition of things not without its advantages, indeed; but there is in it all a hindrance to some of the noblest sympathies of the heart. The rough hand of the business world hardens the sympathies, stifles compassion, and dries up the fountains of human emotion. The cold steel of financial watchfulness and caution freezes up the springs of the affections and gives civilization a callous heart. Strong men come from their places of business and bend over their own dead without a tear, while all the time they wonder at their own dead humanities. These necessities of

trade have in them iron-tempered laws. Commerce, with its fight and its grim requirements, its constant elbow-crowding with the masses, unrelieved by the force of any agency besides its own, demands the burial of much holy emotion, and puts an encysted gall around the human heart. The world of trade needs to be modified by religion. The old Platonic principle of separating mothers from their children for the purpose of eliminating what was regarded as a weakness, is silently operative in these busy days, and needs the relief of a rest from the contest, the contemplating of holy things. I say the life men are now leading needs that; the business they follow needs it.

It must be remembered, also, that the purity of the personal life is more difficult to maintain as population increases, and as administration covers larger areas and embraces such varieties of people and interests. The progress of civilization, which puts large populations into comparatively small areas, will, in the course of events, assuage the fiercer and coarser passions. It is also less favorable to the sterling virtues which preserve character and secure the vigor of the race. While the refinements and cultures of life add to it both a polish and an interest, they are not guarantees against corruption. The greatest need of the highest form of civilization is protection from its self-destructives. Motives against vice, and strength to be successfully resistant, are what

is needed. This strength comes out of the moral nature, itself strengthened by religious obligation. The moral forces, thus ribbed and fortified, can alone awaken human sympathy for God, for eternity, for man, and cause it to walk out and command the faculties. The secular side of life now is making the mistake of working with might and main on the surrounding, rather than on the individual character, and this fact constitutes a break between it and the spirit of the gospel. The gospel works on the man. It gives him that which complements and completes his being. It puts on all his acts the weight of eternal consequences, and gives him assurance that he can afford to be a man, and do justly, because the affairs of this life take their place in a perfect scheme; and these acts, therefore, shall not fail of their rewards.

POLITICAL SUPREMACY INHERES IN THE GOSPEL.

It has been repeatedly insisted, by way of limiting the influence of Christian thought and teaching, that the English, German, and American peoples belong to a sturdy race stock which had in it the potentials of legislative, commercial, scientific, and inventive greatness. We are told that Anglo-Saxons are born for leadership, and that the Christian religion, in no important way, accounts for what the race is. This, to say the least, is to make small account of a very significant phenomenon in the history of the race. It

also involves itself in the necessity of explaining the fact that Christianity ever grappled with so strong a race stock, and that, too, before it had made large advances; and also the other fact that, from the date of its inception backward, are a greater number of centuries than have passed since; and there should be with this the explanation of the fact that only since this ancestral blood was Christianized has it moved swiftly up the curves of progress. Weak forces are not equal to the subjugation of great races. Strong men require strong food. There must be some force in a system that could grapple with such a race stock, and move with it to its highest forms, and remain such a significant factor. That a religion could become so thoroughly infused into the life and energies of a people; that its teachings should become a part of the organic law of the land; that it should become a part of its great literature, and mold so largely the private opinions of its people without affecting its form of government, is unworthy the thought of any healthful mind. The strongest and more successful gospel agencies are now using no coercive measures; neither are they leaning on Cæsar's arm; yet they are in no way dependent. They do not apologize for the presumption of being in the world, neither do they compromise with error. Vital gospel agencies are never presented to the world as mere issues. They accept no divided honor. They are not quantitative, to be mixed with other systems;

they are not a set of formulated rules for the outward life. They are preached, believed, and obeyed as all-important principles, and the kingdom of Christ is set up wherever they prevail. The kingdom of Christ may be set up in social compacts having different outward features and regulations. This kingdom does not depend on any specific outward kind of civil government for its propagation.

Whether republicanism or democracies constitute the gospel idea of civil control I do not know. There may be yet an evolution of society manifesting a political life compared with which this we now have may appear crude and defective. Whether this be true or not, it remains that the gospel is large enough and liberal enough to live under nearly all forms of political doctrine, because these doctrines are not essential things in gospel work and influence. There is that in the gospel which will cause a false political doctrine to die of neglect. The Hebrew faith was perpetuated in connection with a civil system at once simple in its form and imperfect, yet equal to the people it was meant to control.

A monarchy would be abhorrent to the American mind. In the face of such a probability on these shores, all the sanctions of religion might be thrown against it. But the Christian religion has lived and prospered under the monarchies. It has lived through nearly every form of human government without being dependent on any of

them. The gospel need not lend its formal sanction to any form of secular control, because it is superior to all of them. The gospel is degraded whenever it is hinged to any sort of political apparatus. The gospel is able so to keep to its work with whatever may be the prevailing social form, and without putting its seal upon it; or any other as distinguished from it—work under it or through it, and put into it the purifying of the truth.

This attitude of the gospel also attains with reference to any special law or statute that constitutes a part of any set of social principles. It is not within the province of the gospel to give expression on all civil enactments *pro* and *con* as they appear, but its sphere rather is to work away on the foundations, purifying lives and lifting the spirit of the generation to higher conditions.

The apostle Paul never declared himself on Roman policies. There was, indeed, outward and ordinary occasion for it. He could have made a strong case in the name of the humanities. He saw human oppression; he saw corrupt government; he saw defective and inefficient law; but it was the measure of great wisdom in him to remain silent as to outward operative forms, and work away on that which he knew would change the whole of them for the better. It was with this in view that Professor Swing said: "Xenophon's words were eloquent,—Paul's words contained a civilization." His appeal was to the divine life in the human heart.

Early Christianity was kept to its work. There was a vital power in it that kept it from tinkering with political forms. Its end was not to change statutes, but to purify lives. When the gospel pervades a community with this sort of work, statutory forms will easily take care of themselves, because they soon, through a better citizenship, come to express the will of the redeemed life. Certainly the preparation of political codes is not gospel work, because it takes the work of man's social nature out of its hands. If the Church is true to its mission of lifting, by the power of the divine life, statutory forms, in the run of the years, will keep up with the procession. They always have. If gospel work falls short of accomplishing its reasonable possibilities, it is worse than folly to try to accomplish the same thing by what, under the circumstances, must be considered legislative trifling. It is not the business of the organized religious forces to go directly into the work of covering the earth with ideal statutes. If it were possible to achieve such a result at all, it could be done best at a time when the world was in the swift curves to ruin. If the gospel is kept true to its mission by the devout and holy lives of Christians giving it efficacy to lift men from sin, the stability and strength of civil society is secured. Christ's kingdom is not of this world; but whenever his kingdom is established in purity and strength, the kingdoms of this world take upon themselves an enduring

and self-purifying life. The most healthful kind of social forces are not such as put men into the barracks. They have not the features and manipulations of a regular army. They have something of the free and unconscious action of a healthy organism. A healthy body is under the control of a vigorous life, which directs the forces without appearing to do so. The body is ready for its food, ready for its work, ready for the uses of the mind, because its energies are not absorbed in attention to itself. The greatest hygienic law is the unconscious law of living. There is a diseased body, with joints rheumatic, liver deranged, lungs and stomach out of condition, the whole body sick. The doctors take charge of it. It is thoroughly absorbed in itself, and is fit for nothing till it gets well or dies. The best civil society is that in which the laws of citizenship are well understood and freely assented to. In other words, the best society is that in which there is least use for legal and punitive proceedings.

The unwritten law of honor, the unwritten law of friendship, the unwritten law of a neighborly spirit, the unwritten law of love for mankind,—these are the laws of life for the government of the world; and they are born and nurtured by the religion of the Bible. The gospel's purpose is to banish from the human heart all the promptings and movements in that heart which are opposed to justice and holiness and purity. Its purpose is to quicken and exalt the life of human

souls by the breath of God. Its purpose is to move the earth by a sense of the divine. Is this visionary? What else will move it? With what forces are we acquainted stronger than gospel forces? Have not the divine motives moved the human heart and will more fully than any other? These may fail of their end because man is free. The earth has been diseased socially in the face of all of them, and there is great need of all the outward expedients of law and policy, and also the skill and wisdom with which they are applied amounts to very much. There is danger in the careless and slovenly administration of outward remedies; but, after all, the Christ life is the law of man's collective life.

It is frequently said that the gospel is not doing much work that needs to be done, and that the gospel has been a failure in large territories. Regions once prosperous under gospel agencies are now the most pitiable mission-fields on the face of the earth—a sad fact, and, so far as we can see, an inevitable one in human history—but the glory of the situation is that the gospel did not die with these races and civilizations. It has asserted itself superior to them, and teaches the lesson on which we have been insisting all along, that its kingdom is spiritual.

It must be remembered that there is not in the Book a single declaration that the world is to be unconditionally saved. If there are unconditional forces at work, man has nothing to do with

them. They lie outside the boundaries of his knowledge. The gospel does not coerce. It offers salvation to the soul, and, through it, strength to the civil law, order to society, and prosperity to the affairs of men. To accept the offer is to receive the blessing; to keep the offer is to keep the blessing. Dead civilizations signify dead moral and spiritual forces. There is no new way of preserving a nation's life. If the mass of men get weary of living as Christ lived—get weary of standing for the truth, and begin to experiment for an easier way, and when gospel principles do not prevail—does it mitigate against the principle? Is not the principle equal to as great things as ever? Shall the Golden Rule be abolished because men do not obey it? We might as well try to abolish the mountains or the sunshine.

The future safety of the world, and the place the Church shall hold in it, depends on its vital and inward life. The vicious movements of this age having such hold on society is a scandal that overshadows the fair name of religion. Christ's power is bound up with obedience to the great command, "Go ye into all the world," with which all power was given. I refuse to believe that the great social evils with which we are now struggling would have been in existence to-day if the Church had been faithful to its bestowed powers and opportunities. They are the spawn of a degenerated Church. They could not possibly exist

in the days of a Church living to the full measure of its possibilities. Just as Mohammedanism sprang from the decaying missionary fire of the first Christian ages, so has this fell brood of evils, which threaten the life of the Nation, sprung from the human shortcomings of a power equal to the moral strengthening and security of all social affairs. These things among us will not be overthrown by mourning and by talk, or by a political campaign, but by something better and higher.

If this generation of Christians will keep to its work, it will divide the sovereignty with the ruling powers. It will lay a foundation as strong as the everlasting mountains for the future of the race, for it will furnish the springs of reformative as well as redemptive agencies.

Dr. Mendenhall, in "Plato and Paul," says as to the danger to which nations are subject, they are, "Internal decay, extreme opposition, strife within, assault from without. The former is the greater peril. Niebuhr says: 'No nation ever died except by suicide.' Political intrigue, political corruption, the loss of individual virtue, the decline of the family institution, the love of vicious luxuries, have been more effective in national overthrow than organized external war against a people."

We have seen enough of God's hand in history to know that unless we co-operate with the divine purpose in working out the Nation's destiny, after having seen that the Christian religion is that

by which alone the desired saving influences can be realized for institutions like ours, it becomes no longer a question as to how much sacrifice it will take to preserve our institutions; for the question involves the whole Nation's life. Shall the instincts of self-preservation fail us now?

If the religious life of this country can not produce a generation of men and women through whom a Christian State may be perpetuated, in the next generation there will be no Christian State. It belongs to them to ordain religious regeneration. For the country's sake, we are to help one another to better lives. We are to work away on these souls about us. An ideal community means ideal characters.

It remains for us to learn more perfectly the lesson that franchises and constitutions and the outward forms of society do not constitute government or originate nationalities. Human progress is the balance-sheet of human endeavor. Each day's movement issues a new sheet. Not every day will show an advance; but when the sheets of a generation are balanced, and out of it the human heart takes courage, and also takes a new grip on its age, in the belief that the conditions of human life can be indefinitely made better by human endeavor, then the future shall appear rather glorious. Gold and silver may be consumed, but personal virtue and constancy have been secured from dissolution. Our greatest questions have never been commercial or material,

but personal. Integrity and strength of personal character produces integrity and strength of citizenship, and integrity and strength of citizenship means the iron ribs of justice and right for the body of the common law.

Among a free people this outward glory always quadrates with the average man. Public morality quadrates with private virtue. Social purity, Sabbatic observance, temperance, respect for the whole Decalogue, have their prerequisites in the lives of the people. A nation built on a material foundation will perish; but established in righteousness, the stars in their courses will fight for it.

XIV.

MISTAKEN AND HASTY METHODS FOR THE OVERTHROW OF SOCIAL EVILS.

THE spirit of reform has been pre-eminently strong among all people upon whom the gospel has taken hold to the degree to influence the life. It is in the nature of the Christian religion to awaken hope and expectation of a future greater than the past for the individual and for the mass. The gospel, addressing itself to evil conditions, expects to supplant the evil with the good. A pure gospel knows nothing of despair. If the Christian system is true, the promises are sure; and the promises are that power shall be given to meet and become equal to any possible exigency. This quality in the gospel may account, in part, for the exceeding hopefulness of this age. Christianity, in its temper and spirit, has been constantly engaged in the endeavor to put man into higher and better relationships with himself.

It will not take an argument to induce the intelligent reader to the belief that it has been successful. It has not been successful in all cases where it has put itself against an evil in society, because its own spirit has been given over by the human heart before the work was done; but the

fact remains that the gospel is a social regenerator. It never touches but to lift. The whole spirit of the gospel is reformative. In whatever shape sin throws out its black banner, the gospel is against it. Its courage is to face all the evil conditions of the world. Tyranny of rulership, human slavery, polygamy, the social evil, the wrongs of poverty, opium, alcohol, the whole fell brood, is addressed by the gospel spirit. It works away on these things, through all vicissitudes of defeat and change, with a quenchless power; and as the generations come and go new light appears, the stream of thought and conviction advances, the morning hastens, and the world is made better.

We desire here to devote a few pages to some of the hindrances to the free and full application of the Christian faith to the interests of society. It becomes the Christian to have an understanding of his times. The mere enthusiast is not the best adviser. Those Christians who simply shout on the battle, regardless of the position and number of the enemy and of the reliable laws of social advancement, are not the better soldiers. After an army has been flanked and captured, its position is never tenable. The faith we have in God is not to put out the eyes of human foresight. The best of purposes are sometimes hitched to the star not destined to succeed. The purpose which has its eye only on the stars will see, sooner or later, that its stumbles will have

consequences. A policy for human beings which puts human beings out of sight is never practical. The thing which ought to be, never comes about by leaving out of the estimate that which is.

The inseparable force of a reform movement is its fanaticism. Conservative agencies preserve that which is; they never overthrow the evil and enthrone the good. Encysted sin is a strong resistant, and never yields except under intense pressure. A healthful fanaticism is an essential element in the evolution of society. A fanaticism of heated thought, a fanaticism of conviction, a fanaticism of advocacy, a fanaticism of persistence, is legitimate, pure, healthful, and it wins.

There is a fanaticism so called which repels. It invades the personality of others. It is assumptive to the loss of friendships for itself and its cause. It is without reason and without considerations of deference to that which is, even to show why it should not be. It urges its issues without respect to the opinions of others. Its attitude is such that to question the efficiency of its methods is to be stung with the odium of promoting the evil against which it is arrayed. Its positions are empirical. It uses the moral boycott. It has a wolfish frenzy for all who stand in the way of its hotly-conceived plans. It is a fanaticism which carries with it a blank receipt for the millennium. Its special scheme is an unfailing specific for all human ills. It has about it

the non-improvable quality. It blasts with sinister motives whoever may offer anything in the place of that which it proposes. A high-priest of morals and religion, it begins by assuming the argument, and ends by causing revulsion in the minds of all fair people. The good cause which it espouses gives evidence of being of God, and non-destructible in that it is not defeated by it as it undertakes to guide it to its final issues. The advance movements of society are hindered by those who come into it with plans and specifications wrought out beforehand. There is nothing more definitely settled in these movements than the fact that the immediate means by which a great end for the race is achieved is not seen long beforehand. In the final resolves of a reform, it is the unexpected which happens. What theories for the overthrow of slavery for a half century before the work was done! How many of these prepared plans were successful? The final agency was an exigency of war. How swift and sure are the agencies when the world is ripe for them! They are providential. They have more of the divine than the human in them, and they take care of themselves.

In the social structure you build as you go. You can not order pieces ahead, as in carpentering. Society is not a construction; it is not a piece of architecture. It refuses to shape itself to any preconceived theory. Society is a growth; it is a slow growth. It grows from forces within—

some apparent, some occult. It grows as the body grows, in obedience to fundamental laws. If this fact can be kept clearly before the public mind, it will assuage the asperities that arise as to methods. There can be no rigidly shaped patterns for the regulation of evils before there is a general acceptance of principles. Every movement in society has to construct its own institutions. That with which we have to do principally is the movement itself—the principles that underlie it. To lose sight of these is to begin to retrograde. When the fundamental features of a movement are kept in the foreground, its institutions are not difficult of construction or execution. Wherever there is strife over the institutions of a movement to the extent that they are considered all-important, and are expected to carry things with them, the movement itself is not ripe, and needs strengthening from the bottom.

Hasty methods in sociology are not satisfactory. The time element enters into all growths, and the more complex the organism the slower the growth. Man gets impatient of social laws. God never does. Institutions that are enduring are the product of slow and toilsome processes. Those who are not pleased with this law are not pleased with the divine order.

Among social agencies there is a success which is quickly gained, but it is not worth what it costs. Superficial means only reach superficial ends. Immediate outside results, regardless of

consequences, are not satisfactory. Deliverance from social ills, through the machinery of law rather than by the growth of character, is an impatient haste. There may be a sense in which the evils that afflict society ought to be crushed to-morrow. Their existence signifies that there is something wrong, and wrongs ought to be speedily righted; and if repressive measures, independent of the growth of society, were ever effective, the sensible thing would be to rally a crowd and blot them out instanter.

The social body never helps itself by a proclamation of negatives, because the human mind naturally resists the acceptance of such a condition. In the place of that which ought not to be, there must be placed that which ought to be. Repression does not furnish the positive forces, which are the all-important things. Repression helps to make way for the positive forces; but that spirit in man which produces the evils to be repressed must be subdued by the incoming of higher impulses, and this work is from the inside. It is work to be done on the human character. The "maw" for alcohol will spawn into other evils, even if its direct object were taken out of reach. There must be other work than that of cutting away opportunity. In fact, outward law is not able to keep from the heart the opportunity to transgress. This remorseless drift toward evil that breeds all social ill, will make its own opportunity. It is not limited to a

single object. If all the alcohol in existence were destroyed, the potential of evil in the human heart would be by no means defeated. It would laugh at the imbecility of the method, and straightway call into being other foul methods of gratification. So the kingdom to be conquered is not in the law or in politics, but in the mind and heart of man. Society must grow out of the evils which afflict it, as corn grows out of the soil. There must be repression, indeed, as the plow represses the weeds or they choke the corn; but the corn must grow. Repression is not the chief thing; the growth is chief, and for this purpose the soil must be cultivated. Society needs repressive agencies. It must have them; the more thorough the better; but if there is no inherency of growth; if the vital principle of character is not there, repression is a failure, because useless. Character is essential. Without it, despair is over the face of society. Virtue, honor, truth, integrity, devotion,—these are the qualities of which character is made, and they are voluntarily invoked. If these are lacking in the social body, it is folly to expect satisfactory outside conditions.

These things, or the things which take their places, constitute outside conditions. The supreme question with this, or any question, is, Shall these principles prevail? The growth of the better principles arises out of constant and steady relations, which, if a little slow, are satisfactory.

A generation may go by before the nebulous condition of thought and sentiment concerning them is crystallized into anything like an accepted policy; but the policy is of little moment as compared with the strength of the principles. To force a policy ahead of the principles of which active convictions are born is a cheap glory, and it seems real, but it must suffer defeat in the end. The welfare of society is dependent on those who can value the solidity of a foundation, rather than the fresco and architectural finish of a structure whose base is unsteady.

There can also be a state of things in which it were wholly useless to propose a civil measure which is ideally the best. The great Solon only gave his subjects such laws as they were able to bear. Christ said of certain things: "Ye can not bear them now." A civil measure which is only a small installment of the highest need may be practically meritorious; and if the measure is in the interests of reform, it harmonizes with the sound social philosophy of moving toward the end bit by bit. Those who hold theological or social or political finalities are disturbing elements in the swift movements and shifts of a great reform. Any particular stage or status of a reform movement is not a finality, but a tentative provisional activity. Emile de Laveleye, the famous Belgian politico-economist, says: "In everything we should proceed by transition. . . . By the spirit of reform we should make a place

for traditions." France came suddenly to a republic, and her history has been stormy. A people under a monarchy for a thousand years can not get rid of the old, strait way. Moses knew slavery was wrong. He endured it because ideal conditions, in the nature of things, could not be secured. Does the world doubt the wisdom of his statesmanship?

The failure of many reform methods is in underestimating the power of an organized evil, and of believing that it can only be removed by one great, swift drastic operation.

A few years ago the English civil service reforms were on the edge of great success in their undertakings, and, in a flush of enthusiasm, they proposed a miracle of civil readjustments. They brought in a bill that civil service employees should not receive more than five hundred pounds. The higher officials of the Nation combined for self-protection, and defeated the measure. The reformers went too far too soon. They were beaten needlessly even in matters which ought to have prevailed. The expectation of suddenly changing the whole spirit of a nation's legislation on any question is entirely chimerical.

The method which has been tested by experience, and is under its law, is that of work in the two directions of educating the public conscience, and of closing more and more the avenues of mischief. To undertake to carry the whole question

of morals by an exhortation and an assault is a rash procedure, and it is never satisfactory to the mass of citizens. Preach ideals, but deal with facts.

In the advocacy of a good cause the element of shrewdness is permissible. Care should be exercised that no position be taken in which it should appear as an ordinary expectation beforehand that the end shall be defeated. It has come to pass that many of our sincerest efforts are associated with the idea of defeat. A position may be taken which is morally sound as to its end, but expediently unwise as to its means. If an embattled wall is to be battered down, shall the enthusiast go butt his head against it till the cannon are unlimbered? No. Let the enthusiast save his head. A cause is never so good or great as to justify a senseless undertaking with reference to it. Before we arouse his Satanic majesty, we should make arrangements that the contest will not be unequal against him. Shall we deliberately invite him to show his horns, and not be prepared to knock them when they come up? Why institute a plan predestined to defeat? Modern warfare does not favor storming an impregnable fortress. The end must be reached by some other means. Reformers may learn a lesson from the latest methods of the military art. The bull on the railroad track is commended for his courage, not for his sense. If his purpose is to ditch the train, a shrewder plan would be to

charge on the section hands after they have taken up a rail.

Shall those who have at heart a good cause, which must be won by conflict, be careless of the element of tact? Shall they go blindly into the battle because it is the Lord's? Let zeal have knowledge; let faith have eyes; let the spirit of advancement have prudence and foresight.

INDEX.

PAGE.

Alexander, ... 11
Accretive Principle: An inside force, strong, ... 12
Creative, ... 13
Reliable, ... 12
Aristotle, ... 7, 36
America: Providence in the discovery and settlement, . . 69
Atheism, ... 92
Anglo-Saxons: Leadership of, ... 112, 169
Must overcome, ... 125
Alcohol: The maw for, ... 185

Bismarck, ... 10, 42
Bonaparte, ... 54, 55
And the spirit of his time, ... 51
Beecher, H. W., ... 52
Bible: Its influence, social, ... 87
Its place in the law, ... 87
In the public schools, ... 91
Its teaching on our theme, ... 37
Based on primary truths, ... 27
Bellamy, ... 106
Ballot, The, and woman, ... 160
A political act, ... 147
Moral force of non-determinable, ... 148
Buckley: On futility of legislation alone, ... 119, 153

Creeds: Ancient, civil, ... 9, 10
Bases of, ... 15
Constitutions, not contracts, ... 13
Not supreme, ... 15
American, first amendment, ... 84
School commissioners, etc., ... 97
Do not originate States, ... 178

PAGE.

Cocker, B. F., ... 19
Consciousness: Personal, ... 22
Christ: His attitude toward the civil power, ... 38
Church: Its first triumph, ... 39
Its decay in Latin age, ... 40
Supremacy of, ... 41
Completion and results of, ... 43
Can not use outward force, ... 76
Getting weary, ... 79
Discipline, law of land, ... 133
Must not intrude 134, 135
Action on political matters, ... 156
Needs influence of men of all parties, ... 151
Not equal to its possibilities, ... 177
Curry, Daniel: His theory of government as related to religion, ... 73
Colonies: Jamestown their type, ... 70
State religion abolished, ... 71
Civil supremacy, in Europe, ... 81
Christianity, recognized, ... 85
Early, ... 173
Its strength, ... 170
Commandments: Their relation to civil control, ... 86
Character, and citizenship, ... 89
How secured, ... 98
In the school-room, ... 97
Lack of, ... 108
Value of, ... 179
Civilization: How secured, ... 110
How maintained, ... 112
Civil law: Its use and limitations, ... 113
It has the day, ... 136
Conscience: Public, whence, ... 116
Conservatism of existing forms, ... 123
Christian life and the secular spirit, ... 137
Conventions: Political, ... 153
Christians should know their times, ... 181

David, ... 11
Doubt, not conclusive as against the religious impulse, . 22

PAGE.
Disciples: Their conception of Christ's kingdom, ... 38
Their dullness, ... 39
Their commission, ... 39
Da Costa, ... 57
De Laveleye: Testimony to the value of religion in society, ... 59, 187
Doctrine, as related to morals, ... 75
De Pressensé, ... 124
Dio Lewis: Vices and crimes, ... 125

England: Her faith, ... 61
Ethics, in the schools, ... 88
Civic same as Biblical, ... 86
Not large provision for in public schools, ... 96
How presented, ... 97
Distinctions among masses, ... 118
Evils, of civilization, ... 122
Organized, ... 188

Family, The: Relation to the State, ... 8
False systems: Religious, ... 25
France: Reformation not complete in, ... 50
Revolution, ... 54
Cause of French defeat in Franco-Prussian War, . 56
Present danger, ... 59
Fanaticism: Healthful, ... 182
Vicious, ... 182

Government: Limitation and powers, ... 13
Responsible to primary laws, ... 14
Its bases, ... 86
Origin of, ... 11
False theories of (see *Paternity*), ... 11, 15
Grotius, ... 7
Gibbon, ... 32
Gospel: Power in the State, ... 39
Political supremacy in it, ... 169
Exists under different social forms, ... 171
Reason of its failures, ... 175
Guizot, ... 56

PAGE.

Germany: Scholarship and doubt, ... 64
Organic civil and religious forces in, ... 65
Gladden, ... 116
Graham, Professor, ... 116

Hoadley, ... 7
History: Its two focal points, ... 30
Hagenbach, ... 54

Ignorance: Argument from, ... 24, 25
Introspection: First great age of, ... 35
Immoral literature, ... 58
Italy: Present civil supremacy, ... 66
Institutionalism, ... 77
Individualism, of the Gospel, ... 163

Jews: Theocratic spirit of, ... 31
Unable to see Christ's social teachings, ... 32
Jewish code, its purpose, ... 31
Not an ideal government, ... 31

Life, in social body, ... 16
Locke, ... 7
Luther, ... 48
Legislation: Unfriendly, ... 80
Lycurgus, ... 101
Law: Unwritten 174
Outward, responsible to primary, ... 14

Man, greater than the State, ... 10
And the universe, ... 23
His nature, ... 25
A unit, mind, ... 29
Mair, Alexander, ... 19
McCosh, ... 26
Mythology: Its decay, ... 36
Middle Ages, ... 45
Morals, and population, ... 168
Revolt against, ... 56
Instinctive, ... 90

PAGE.
State can teach without dogma, ... 94
Supreme, ... 116
And partisanship, ... 142
Public, what, ... 56, 119
Millemaine, ... 56
Mexico: Confiscation, ... 66
Majorities: Questions of religious belief in, ... 92
Rule in political matters, ... 150
Politically right, ... 148
Magna Charta, ... 113
Miller, Justice: A decision, ... 133
Municipal Law, ... 118
Moral suasion: Its weakness, strength, ... 120
Masses, must be moved in reform, ... 149
Materialism, disintegrating, ... 159
Mohammedanism, ... 177
Mendenhall, ... 177
Moses: His relation to slavery, ... 188

Nature: Knowledge of, ... 35
Non-interference: The policy of, ... 80
Niebuhr, ... 177

Organic union: Calamities of, ... 67
In Germany, ... 65
Opinion: Slow growth of, ... 115
Opinion and the statute, ... 117

Plutarch, ... 18
Persistence: Principle of in religious instinct, ... 24
Plato, ... 26
His conception of the infinite, ... 36
Politics, as related to ethics, ... 79
Public schools: Their power, permanence, defects, . . 83, 84
Morality in, how taught, ... 88
Character of the teaching force, ... 96
Theology in, ... 88
Paternity, in government, ... 105
Pitt, ... 114
Prayer: Its value, ... 121

PAGE.
Personal liberty, not independent of the mass, ... 126
Prohibition, in repressive law, ... 128
In Church councils, ... 129
Constitutional and statutory, ... 129, 130
Power: The thirst for, ... 136
Protestantism, must keep off grounds of Romanism, . . 134
Parties, and popular government, ... 139
Relation to moral declarations, ... 141
Phariseeism: Political, ... 142
Platforms: Political, what they should contain, ... 142
Politician: What he is, ... 144
Reforms not to be expected from him, ... 145, 146
Preachers: Their place in modern society, ... 157
Patriotism, and crowded population, ... 167
Paul, never declared himself on civil policies, ... 172
Philology: Value in the interpretation of ethnic systems, 34

Religion: Significant impulse, ... 18
Quenchless, universal, ... 19, 20
The impulse not an infallible guide to truth, . . . 20
Stronger in first ages, ... 30
Its power in ancient government, ... 32
Value of to State, ... 60, 62, 76, 160, 162
Sphere and limitation, ... 75, 150
Reasons for organization of, ... 131, 132
Recognized by supreme law, ... 133
Realism, ... 22
Romanism, in Mexico, Africa, and South America, . . . 44
Relation to the civil power, ... 45
Responsible for French Revolution, ... 50
Reformation: Change of civil and religious relationships, 48
Roman law: Its source, ... 102
Reform: Causes, ... 114
Peculiar to Christianity, ... 180
Constructs its own institutions, ... 184
Moral and legal agencies combined, ... 146
Revivals: Social influence of, ... 115
Regulation: Municipal, ... 119
Repression, of evil, ... 186
Rousseau, ... 7

PAGE.
Sparta: Political basis of, ... 10
Her laws, ... 101
State: Responsibility of, ... 14, 15
Source in social instinct, ... 16
Roman idea of, ... 9, 37
At first concrete, ... 8
Its relation to ethics and theology, ... 88, 93
Non-sectarian, ... 154
Schleiermacher, ... 26
Spencer, ... 28
Spiritual world: Reality of, ... 22
Society, never accepts a pure negative, ... 185
Non-ecclesiastical now, ... 157
A growth, ... 9, 183, 184
Limitations, ... 73
Society: Its right to protect itself, ... 121, 125
Cost of remaining healthful, ... 124
Senses, The: Their use and reliability, ... 23
Secular spirit: First growth slow, ... 33
Its first ascendency, ... 36
Breaking with the Church, ... 53
Its temper, ... 66, 80
Spontaneous belief, ... 35
Socrates: Self-knowledge, ... 36
Strong, ... 38
Schaff: His mistake, ... 72
Sunday-schools, and moral training, ... 89
Statute laws: Sources, ... 102
Definition of, ... 100
Use and limitations, ... 101
Present form not final, ... 102
Should express principles, ... 103, 104
Defects of special legislation, ... 103
Secondary, ... 159
How enthroned, ... 165
Social ills: Easy methods for the cure of, ... 109
Slavery: Abolition of, ... 114
Solon, ... 101

PAGE.
Socialism: Its primary blunder, ... 165
Swing, Professor, ... 172

Tyranny: Its sources, ... 15, 65
"Truce of God:" Its origin, and Rome's use of it, . . . 46
Thiers, M., ... 59
Truth: Its inclusiveness, ... 91
Tact: Its value, ... 189

United States: Relation of civil and religious forces in, 72, 74

Vandals: Transalpine invasion, and attitude toward the Church, ... 45
Voltaire, ... 8, 56
Voluntary forces: Leading, ... 108

Warburton, ... 7
Wesley: Result of his revivals, ... 61
Woolsey: His theory of the State's power, ... 75
Worship: Primitive heathen forms, ... 34

H, 190

DATE DUE

United Theological Seminary Library
MAIN HN64.H25 1890
Halstead, Wil Civil and religious forces
3 0645 0005 8975 0